

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

VOTING RECORD

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1982

● Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, it has become my practice from time to time to list my votes in the House of Representatives here in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I strongly believe that the people of southern Arizona have the right to know where I stand on the issues decided by the House, and I have found that printing my record here is the best way to provide that information.

This is not an all-inclusive list. I have omitted noncontroversial votes such as quorum calls, motions to resolve into the Committee of the Whole House, and motions to approve the Journal of the previous day.

The descriptions are necessarily somewhat short, and I am sure that some of my constituents will have additional questions about the issues described here. So I invite them to write me for specifics, or to visit my district office at 300 North Main, Tucson.

The list is arranged as follows:

KEY

1. Official roll call number;
 2. Number of the bill or resolution;
 3. Title of the bill or resolution;
 4. A description of issue being voted on;
 5. The date of the action;
 6. My vote, in the form Y=yes, N=no, and NV=not voting.
 7. The vote of the entire Arizona delegation, in the form (Yes-No-Not voting);
 8. An indication whether the motion or amendment was passed or rejected; and
 9. The total vote.
157. H.R. 1311. National Tourism Policy. Motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to replace the U.S. Travel Service with a new U.S. Travel and Tourism Administration within the Commerce Department and to authorize \$6.5 million in fiscal 1982 for tourism programs. July 28. Y(3-1-0). Agreed to 321-98.
158. H. Con. Res. 160. Monetary Policy and High Interest Rates. Motion to suspend the rules and adopt the resolution stating it is the "sense of Congress" that since interest rates are "needlessly and destructively" high Congress and the administration should take actions to reduce future budget deficits; encourage the banking system to provide credit to those who contribute to long term productivity, and encourage the Federal Reserve to lower interest rates. July 28. Y(4-0-0). Agreed to 403-17.
159. H.R. 4053. Mineral Leasing Act Amendments. Motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to make it easier for private companies to produce synthetic fuel from oil shale on federal lands. July 28. Y(4-0-0). Agreed to 408-5.

160. H.R. 4121. Treasury, Postal Service, General Government Appropriations fiscal 1982. Amendment to delete \$5 million earmarked for the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms in the Treasury Department. July 28. Y(4-0-0). Adopted 279-141.

161. H.R. 4121. Treasury, Postal Service, General Government Appropriations fiscal 1982. Amendment to delete \$13.6 million earmarked for the Savings Bond Division of the Treasury Department which promotes the purchase of government savings bonds. July 28. Y(2-2-0). Adopted 223-190.

163. H.R. 4242. Tax Cuts. Motion to order the previous question (thus ending further debate) on the rule (H. Res. 198) providing for House floor consideration of the bill. July 29. Y(4-0-0). Agreed to 282-148.

164. H.R. 4242. Tax Cuts. Adoption of the rule (H. Res. 198) providing for House floor consideration of the bill. July 29. Y(4-0-0). Adopted 280-150.

165. H.R. 4242. Tax Cuts. Substitute amendment to the bill to provide a one year reduction in income tax rates skewed to benefit most those earning less than \$50,000 per year and to provide narrowly targeted business and investment tax incentives. July 29. Y(1-3-0). Rejected 144-288.

166. H.R. 4242. Tax Cuts. Substitute amendment to the bill to reduce individual income tax rates by 25 percent across the board over three years, to index tax rates beginning in 1985 and to provide business and investment tax incentives. July 29. N(3-1-0). Adopted 238-195.

167. H.R. 4242. Tax Cuts. Passage of the bill to amend the Internal Revenue Service Code of 1954 by reducing individual income tax rates by 25 percent across the board over three years, indexing tax rates beginning in 1985 and providing business and investment tax incentives. July 29. N(3-1-0). Passed 323-107.

168. H. Res. 124. Policy Toward Poland. Adoption of the resolution expressing the sense of the House that the U.S. could not remain indifferent to any internal repression or external aggression against the people of Poland and that such developments would have serious consequences for East-West relations. July 30. Y(4-0-0). Adopted 410-1.

169. H.R. 4121. Treasury, Postal Service, General Government Appropriations fiscal 1982. Amendment to restore \$13.6 million to the Treasury Department for the promotion of U.S. Treasury bonds. July 30. N(2-2-0). Rejected 203-210.

170. H.R. 4121. Treasury, Postal Service, General Government Appropriations fiscal 1982. Amendment to reduce for the Executive Office of the President to the fiscal year 1981 level. July 30. Y(1-3-0). Rejected 164-253.

171. H.R. 4121. Treasury, Postal Service, General Government Appropriations fiscal 1982. Amendment to prohibit the use of funds under the Federal Employees Health Benefit Program for abortions, except when the life of the mother is endangered. July 30. N(3-1-0). Adopted 253-167.

172. H.R. 4121. Treasury, Postal Service, General Government Appropriations fiscal 1982. Amendment to prohibit the Internal Revenue Service from implementing or the courts from enforcing IRS regulations to

deny tax exempt status to private schools that discriminate against racial minorities, unless the court order or regulation was in effect prior to Aug. 22, 1978. July 30. Y(4-0-0). Adopted 337-83.

173. H.R. 4121. Treasury, Postal Service, General Government Appropriations fiscal 1982. Amendment to reduce by \$13.6 million the appropriations for the Savings Bond Division of the Treasury Department. July 30. Y(2-2-0). Rejected 182-233.

174. H.R. 4121. Treasury, Postal Service, General Government Appropriations fiscal 1982. Passage of the bill to appropriate \$9,745,292,000 in fiscal 1982 for the Treasury Department, United States Postal Service, Executive Office of the President and 10 independent agencies. July 30. Y(3-1-0). Passed 323-94.

175. H.R. 4169. State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary Appropriations fiscal 1982. Adoption of the rule (H. Res. 188) providing for House floor consideration of the bill to appropriate fiscal 1982 funds for the Department of State, Justice and Commerce, the federal judiciary, and related agencies. July 30. Y(3-1-0). Adopted 262-133.

176. H.R. 4331/H.R. 3982. Social Security Minimum Benefits/Budget Reconciliation. Motion to order the previous question (thus ending further debate) on the rule (H. Res. 203) providing for consideration of 1) the bill H.R. 4331 to amend the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 H.R. 3982 to restore minimum Social Security benefits and 2) the reconciliation act conference report. July 31. Y(4-0-0). Agreed to 271-151.

177. H.R. 4331/H.R. 3982. Social Security Minimum Benefits/Budget Reconciliation. Adoption of the rule (H. Res. 203) providing for consideration of 1) the bill H.R. 4331 to amend the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 H.R. 3982 to restore minimum Social Security benefits and 2) the reconciliation act conference report. July 31. Y(4-0-0). Adopted 370-52.

178. H.R. 4331/H.R. 3982. Social Security Minimum Benefits/Budget Reconciliation. Passage of the bill H.R. 4331 to amend the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 H.R. 3982 to restore minimum Social Security benefits. July 31. Y(3-1-0). Passed 404-20.

179. H.R. 4242. Tax Cuts. Motion to suspend the rules and adopt the conference report on the bill to cut individual income tax rates by 25 percent across the board over 33 months; require that individual income taxes be adjusted or indexed annually to offset the effects of inflation, starting in 1985; allow accelerated depreciation for business investment in new assets; and provide special savings and investment incentives. Aug. 4. N(2-1-1). Agreed to 282-95.

180. H.R. 4169. State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary Appropriations fiscal 1982. Amendment to prevent the Justice Department from requiring communities to accept subsidized housing as part of the Department's enforcement of the 1968 fair housing law. Sept. 9. N(2-1-1). Rejected 188-202.

181. H.R. 4169. State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary Appropriations fiscal 1982. Amendment to bar the Justice Department from using funds contained in the bill to block implementation of voluntary prayer

and meditation in public schools. Sept. 9. N(1-1-2). Adopted 333-54.

182. H.R. 4169. State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary Appropriations fiscal 1982. Amendment to delete \$241 million for the Legal Service Corporation. Sept. 9. N(2-1-1). Rejected 122-272.

183. H.R. 4169. State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary Appropriations fiscal 1982. Passage of the bill to appropriate \$8,683,999,000 for the Departments of State, Justice and Commerce, the federal judiciary and related agencies. Sept. 9. Y(1-2-1). Passed 245-145.

184. H.R. 4209. Transportation Appropriations fiscal 1982. Motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole to consider the bill to provide fiscal 1982 funds for the Transportation Department and related agencies. Sept. 10. Y(3-0-1). Agreed to 367-3.

185. H.R. 4209. Transportation Appropriations fiscal 1982. Amendments, considered en bloc, to increase funds for the Coast Guard by \$84 million. Sept. 10. Y(1-2-1). Rejected 129-260.

186. H.R. 4209. Transportation Appropriations fiscal 1982. Amendment to reduce funds for the Office of the Secretary by \$1 million. Sept. 10. NV(1-1-2). Adopted 209-172.

187. H.R. 4209. Transportation Appropriations fiscal 1982. Amendment to increase funds for the Coast Guard by \$6.19 million and to prohibit the use of funds to reduce civilian employment below the fiscal 1981 level. Sept. 10. Y(2-1-1). Adopted 283-98.

188. H.R. 4209. Transportation Appropriations fiscal 1982. Amendment to bar the use of funds to enforce a rule reducing air traffic at Washington, D.C. National Airport, below the daily levels of July 31, 1981. Sept. 10. N(2-1-0). Adopted 204-188.

190. H. Con. Res. 153. Martin Luther King Jr. Statue. Motion to suspend the rules and adopt the concurrent resolution to authorize \$25,000 for a memorial sculpture of Martin Luther King Jr. to be placed in the Capitol building. Sept. 15. Y(2-0-2). Agreed to 386-16.

191. H.R. 4034. HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations, Fiscal 1982. Adoption of the conference report on the bill to appropriate \$60,689,970,200 in fiscal 1982 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development and 20 related agencies. Sept. 15. Y(1-1-2). Adopted 209-197.

192. H.R. 3380. Military Pay. Amendment to increase the basic pay of senior enlisted personnel by 18-22 percent and the basic pay of junior enlisted personnel by 7-9 percent. Sept. 15. N(0-2-2). Rejected 170-232.

193. H.R. 3380. Military Pay. Passage of the bill to increase the basic pay of all military personnel by 14.3 percent. Sept. 15. Y(2-0-2). Passed 396-1.

194. H.J. Res. 325. Fiscal 1982 Continuing Appropriations. Passage of the joint resolution to provide interim spending authority, from Oct. 1 to Nov. 1, 1981, for certain federal agencies whose regular fiscal 1982 appropriations have not become law. Sept. 16. NV(0-1-3). Passed 281-107.

195. H.R. 4241. Military Construction Appropriations, Fiscal 1982. Passage of the bill to appropriate \$6,887,542,000 for military construction projects in fiscal 1982. Sept. 16. Y(2-0-2). Passed 382-24.

196. H.R. 3518. State Department Authorization. Adoption of the rule (H. Res 182) providing for House floor consideration of the bill. Sept. 17. Y(3-0-1). Adopted 385-5.

197. H.R. 3518. State Department Authorization. Motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole for consid-

eration of the bill. Sept. 17. Y(3-0-1). Motion agreed to 379-3.

198. H.R. 3518. State Department Authorization. Amendment to prohibit U.S. contributions to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) if that organization implements any policy or procedure to license journalists or their publications, censor or otherwise restrict the free flow of information within or among countries, or impose mandatory codes of journalistic practice or ethics. Sept. 17. Y(3-0-1). Adopted 372-19.

199. H.R. 3518. State Department Authorization. Passage of the bill to authorize fiscal 1982 and 1983 programs of the State Department, the International Communication Agency and the Board for International Broadcasting. Sept. 17. N(1-2-1). Rejected 165-226.

200. H.J. Res. 220. Honorary U.S. Citizenship for Raoul Wallenberg. Motion that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, as amended, to proclaim as an honorary U.S. citizen the Swedish diplomat Raoul Wallenberg, who helped Hungarian Jews escape Nazi extermination during WW II and was taken prisoner by the Soviet Union after the war. Sept. 22. Y(4-0-0). Motion agreed to 396-2.

201. H. Con. Res. 183. National Rugby Team of South Africa. Motion that the House suspend the rules and adopt the concurrent resolution stating the sense of Congress that the Springbok National Rugby Team of South Africa, on tour in the U.S., should not play rugby in the U.S. Sept. 22. Y(1-3-0). Motion rejected 201-198.

202. H.R. 1953. Office of Environmental Quality Reauthorization. Motion that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended, to authorize \$44,000 per year for the Council on Environmental Quality and its staff under the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970 in each of fiscal years 1982, 1983 and 1984. Sept. 22. Y(2-2-0). Motion agreed to 360-42.

203. H.R. 4522. District of Columbia Appropriation, Fiscal 1982. Amendment to ban the use of personnel lotteries to hire District of Columbia police officers and fire fighters. Sept. 22. NV(3-0-1). Adopted 305-96.

204. H.R. 4522. District of Columbia Appropriation, Fiscal 1982. Passage of the bill to appropriate \$2,389,228,200 for fiscal 1982 for the operations of the District of Columbia government. Sept. 22. Y(2-2-0). Passed 299-105.

205. H.R. 4. Intelligence Agent Identities Protection Act. Amendment to provide that anyone exposing the identity of a U.S. covert agent with "reason to believe" the exposure might "impair or impede U.S. intelligence operations would be guilty of a crime punishable by up to three years in prison and a fine of up to \$15,000. Replaced proposal that one would be guilty of a crime only if the exposure was made "with intent to impair or impede" U.S. intelligence. Sept. 23. N(3-1-0). Adopted 226-181.

206. H.R. 4. Intelligence Agent Identities Protection Act. Amendment to include the identities of retired and other former covert agents among those it would be illegal to expose under the provisions of the bill. Sept. 23. Y(4-0-0). Adopted 313-94.

207. H.R. 4. Intelligence Agent Identities Protection Act. Passage of the bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to make it a federal crime to disclose the identities of certain U.S. intelligence officers, agents, informants and sources of operational assistance. Sept. 23. Y(4-0-0). Passed 354-56.

208. H.R. 1520. National Science Foundation Authorization. Amendment, to the amendment in vote 209 below, to reduce the fiscal 1982 authorization for the agency to \$1.08 billion from \$1.16 billion. Sept. 23. Y(1-3-0). Adopted 245-161.

209. H.R. 1520. National Science Foundation Authorization. Amendment, as amended, to reduce to \$1.08 billion from \$1.16 billion fiscal 1982 authorizations for the National Science Foundation. Sept. 23. Y(4-0-0). Adopted 401-5.

210. H.R. 1520. National Science Foundation Authorization. Passage of the bill to authorize \$1.08 billion in fiscal 1982 for the National Science Foundation. Sept. 23. Y(2-2-0). Passed 262-149.

211. H.R. 3210. Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1981. Passage of the bill to authorize \$3.1 billion in fiscal 1983 for interstate highway construction and to set a limit of \$8.2 billion on obligations from the Highway Trust Fund in fiscal 1982. Sept. 24. Y(3-0-1). Passed 377-25.●

A COMMITMENT TO THE PRESERVATION OF HUMAN DIGNITY

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1982

● Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, tonight, at the Hubert Humphrey civil rights award dinner, four men, Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, U.S. Representative DON EDWARDS, the late Roy Wilkins, and Mr. Arnold Aronson, will be honored for their lifetime commitments to the struggle to secure for all Americans the rights of equal protection and opportunity guaranteed by our Constitution. These four gentlemen have devoted their lives to serving the American public in a ceaseless effort to abolish discrimination and racial prejudice in our society.

Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, Chairman of the Civil Rights Commission, has served under five administrations. As Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under President Eisenhower, he was a leader in the attempts to end school desegregation. His work on the Civil Rights Commission mirrors a lifetime of concern for equal rights and the dignity of others.

Roy Wilkins and Arnold Aronson, cofounders of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, were tireless devotees in the fight to secure the rights of blacks and other minorities. The late Roy Wilkins was a major force behind the civil rights movement. As leader of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) for 22 years, Mr. Wilkins worked ceaselessly to shape the organization into a major lobbying force for civil rights. Led by Mr. Wilkins, the NAACP played a vital role in securing the passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

My California colleague and friend, Representative DON EDWARDS, chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee, on Civil and Constitutional Rights, is a champion and active supporter of equal rights. In 1980, he was chief sponsor of the Fair Housing Act and last year Mr. EDWARDS successfully secured House passage of a permanent extension of the Voting Rights Act.

I would like to add my voice to the many who will be honoring these men tonight and to express my personal gratitude and commendation to these gentlemen for their service to our country and for their lifetime devotion to human rights and dignity.●

BLACK HISTORY MONTH

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1982

● Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, February is Black History Month. It has been set aside as a time when we can reflect and learn more about the bittersweet saga that has been the history of blacks in America. But of late, we have begun to hear voices of protest from members of the black community that Black History Month has become an anachronism, that we are perpetuating the separateness of blacks by separating out their contributions to history. That sentiment has much to say for itself; however, and most unfortunately, we have not yet reached the point where the myriad of accomplishments, contributions and literature of black Americans has achieved their just recognition.

History has overlooked the fact that blacks were present at the founding of this country—many as free men, many strapped under the shackles of slavery. But together they laid the foundation and the heritage upon which 26 million black Americans now rest. This foundation, this history must be studied or we as Americans have lost an important part of the past, and, therefore, the bridge to the future.

That is why it continues to be appropriate to review, in the month of February, the tragic tales of slavery, injustice and discrimination as well as the many success stories that reflect the struggles and concerns of black Americans. For, to be sure, black history is our history—the history of our Nation, our people, our lives, as we have faced together the trials of time.

The list of well-known and unsung black heroes is long, but I want to mention two persons who were unique in the tremendous effect they ultimately had on the body politic. I speak of two advisers to Presidents of recent years, Presidents who themselves had an enormous impact on the black community by nature of the pro-

grams and philosophies they espoused. Mr. Speaker, I refer to Mary McLeod Bethune, member of Franklin Delano Roosevelt's "Kitchen Cabinet", and Hobart Taylor, Jr., personal adviser and legal counsel to Lyndon Baines Johnson.

Mary McLeod Bethune was but one of more than 20 black men and women who gathered to advise Franklin Roosevelt. A renowned educator, Bethune founded the "Black Cabinet" of the New Deal, and was the first black to head a Federal office, as the director of the Division of Negro Affairs in the National Youth Administration. Bethune had great access to Roosevelt through his wife, Eleanor, and often met with him to discuss a variety of issues. Her later contributions to the administration of Harry Truman and her work with the National Business League and the National Urban League spread her impact throughout the country.

Hobart Taylor, Jr., a Texan and grandson of a former slave, was an early supporter of Lyndon Johnson and worked to get him first nominated as a Presidential candidate, then as a "ticket balancer" with John Kennedy. With Johnson in the Vice President's office, Taylor became the chief executive officer of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity. In this capacity, and, when Johnson became President, as a liaison with the plans for progress program, Hobart Taylor played an integral role in educating the chiefs of staff of more than 300 American corporations on the negative effects of job discrimination.

Taylor was able to make many of them recognize that the country was losing millions of dollars in earned wages and taxes by ignoring a vital sector of the community—blacks who had been shut out of the marketplace because of their color. His was the logic of dollars and cents, and ultimately, of the good of humanity.

Mr. Speaker, the work of these two Americans had its roots in an acknowledged breadth of experience and ability to force actions from words. Their continual struggle for consensus amid the turmoil of the times proved effective, as it still does today.

While we have made many gains in the political sense, with growing numbers of blacks participating in the process, recently we have seen a visible retreat from commitments made in housing, health, education, and employment.

Dr. Carter G. Woodson, a noted black historian, launched "Negro History Week" in 1926 to underscore and provide for all of us the unique nature of the black contribution to our country. With the expansion and adoption of Black History Month throughout our Nation, February has become not only a month to learn new facts and

appreciate the old, but it has become a month in which to reflect on our accomplishments, and to recommit our efforts to the struggle that continues.

I urge my fellow colleagues to join me in tribute to Black History Month and to the message of courage and perseverance it brings to all of us.●

U.S. INVOLVEMENT IN EL SALVADOR: BEYOND ALL HUMAN UNDERSTANDING

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1982

● Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, as the Reagan administration continues its policy in El Salvador which surpasses all understanding, the Members of this body should look to the great expression of commonsense opposition to that policy throughout the Nation. Confronted by the seeming absence of commonsense in that policy, the American people appropriately ask the question as to what the Reagan administration hopes to do for America, world peace and the people of El Salvador by sending millions of dollars in arms to that tragic country.

The editorial pages of Minnesota newspapers have contributed to the high level of public discussion in Minnesota of our policy toward El Salvador. In the past year, I have shared with me my colleagues on several occasions the texts of newspaper editorials. I would like to do so again today. I urge my colleagues to consider very carefully the commonsense exhortations of the following editorials from the St. Paul Pioneer Press and the Duluth News-Tribune.

[From the St. Paul Pioneer Press, Feb. 4, 1982]

SUPPORTING DEMOCRACY

The campaign to step up United States involvement in El Salvador is in high gear. The secretary of State tells a congressional committee that the United States will do "whatever is necessary" to keep the present Salvadoran government from falling to rebel forces. And just coincidentally, dispatches inform us the rebels have attacked a town and killed "about 100" inhabitants. This is, of course, "according to military"—i.e., Salvadoran government—"sources." At the same time, spokesmen at the State Department express their doubts about the authenticity of reports of a day or two earlier that government troops had "massacred" about 15 persons, many of them women and children.

Americans do well to accept reports of "massacres" from either side with more than a grain or two of salt. The Salvadoran civil war, it should be emphasized, is being fought with propaganda almost as much as with bullets. But in the case of the latest report, of rebels killing villagers, the story seems too conveniently linked with Secretary Haig's insistence on defending what he calls "democracy" in Central America.

American reporters who have spent time with the rebels give a picture of their operations which lends support to such an interpretation.

There is deep irony in Mr. Haig's sudden concern for democracy. Where is his concern for democracy in Guatemala, where a brutally repressive right-wing government is busy making its critics "disappear" by the scores every day. And where, historically, has American interest been all these years while dictators like the Somozas in Nicaragua (where a leftist government is now causing Mr. Haig to agonize over a loss of civil rights) kept the peasantry in subjugation and a privileged oligarchy in power and luxury?

The Salvadoran rebels attacked a government airfield a few days ago and destroyed a flock of equipment, including helicopter gunships. Washington proposes not only to replace this materiel but to augment it considerably—spending perhaps \$300 million within a year or two. Nothing is said about the distinct possibility—nay, probability—that the rebels, who appear daily to be gaining strength among the peasants, will destroy the new equipment, too. Will this bring requests to spend \$500 million, or \$1 billion—or to send American combat troops?

Congressional opponents of more aid for the junta in El Salvador fear the results of increased United States involvement; some are afraid there is another Vietnamese-type military quagmire in the offing. Their fears have some justification.

At the very least, opponents of the administration policy are justified in skepticism about administration testimony in support of funneling more arms to the junta. One administration witness painted a doleful picture of a Central America gone over to the Communists. The sea lanes carrying oil from Venezuela to the United States, he said, could be endangered. By what? The Nicaraguan navy?

PROGRESS IN EL SALVADOR

There is an American law requiring the president to certify to Congress that El Salvador is making "progress" in civil rights, land reform and the like before the United States can send that country any more military aid.

So the president duly certifies the progress and, almost as if to mock him, Salvadoran troops shoot down another 20 or more civilians, many of them women and children, in a raid on "subversives."

The certification process is a charade—but the law virtually begs for a charade. It is a piece of statutory hypocrisy intended to justify a course of action in which the United States is trapped by its sins of the past.

Had the United States, in the last half century, devoted as much attention—and money—to El Salvador (and other countries in Central America) as it now finds itself compelled to pay, there probably would be no need to worry about Communist infiltration in the region. (If the interoceanic canal had been built across Nicaragua, would American attention have been of a more beneficial nature? Had the United States, instead of supporting brutal oligarchies, used its influence and prestige to push the regimes of El Salvador, Honduras, Guatemala and Nicaragua into the political, social and economic reforms demanded by simple justice, terror and counterterror would not now be ravaging these countries.)

Now, however, the United States is caught, sucked into a fight in which the odds are against it, a fight which bears a frightening resemblance to the tragedy we

let ourselves in for in Vietnam. The forces of insurrection are well on their way, exploited by the Communists, to be sure, but inexorably propelled by the injustices of ruthless regimes which never had, and do not now have, any respect for those human rights and dignities which the American law is supposed to measure.

We should have exported another kind of help years ago; now we can only send guns and ammunition, helicopters and military "advisers" in what is probably a futile attempt to stem a movement whose time has come.

[From the Duluth News-Tribune, Feb. 3, 1982]

END THE INSANITY

The United States should take no further part in the murderous insanity gripping El Salvador.

The Reagan administration announced Monday that it will send another \$55 million in military aid to the right-wing military junta which rules El Salvador. And a top State Department official said the White House would ask Congress to approve an additional \$100 million for arms and economic assistance to bolster the regime against a leftist civil war. These mammoth sums for military firepower would be added to the nearly \$200 million which our nation has sent to El Salvador in the past year.

This kind of foreign aid is pure insanity. The American people should scream in protest; scream, "No more!"

There is far too much evidence indicating the ruling junta for brutal, murderous retribution against its own citizens who might not agree with government policy. Just this past weekend at least 20 Salvadorans, including women and children, were killed by government troops in a neighborhood of San Salvador. And the government has a human rights violation record that might do Ghengis Khan proud.

We realize the civil revolution against the government is being influenced by, being fueled by communist elements in Latin America. And we do indeed find that influence objectionable. But we also believe the insurrection in El Salvador would have died, or been killed, long ago if it did not generate wide popular support or at least wide popular acceptance.

Our government is wrong in attempting to stabilize and further entrench this intransigent and oppressive regime. We are helping that regime waste countless human lives while wasting millions of our tax dollars. The administration's efforts also portray our nation as a supporter of human oppression.

We should immediately stop all aid to the government of El Salvador. We should renounce any role in the madness and blood-letting now being practiced there.●

BIRTHDAY RECOGNITION OF MELVIN A. YOUNG, SR.

HON. ROBERT A. YOUNG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1982

● Mr. YOUNG of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to rise to honor my father, Melvin A. Young, Sr., who will celebrate his 80th birthday on February 23, 1982.

In honoring men of today for great achievements, Melvin Young has reached the greatest achievement of all, that of being a loving husband, father, grandfather, and great grandfather. He was married on January 4, 1923, to Margaret Degnan at St. Rose's Church on Goodfellow Boulevard in St. Louis. They celebrated their 59th wedding anniversary 1 month ago. He is the father of nine children, of which I am the oldest. The others are Melvin Jr., Joseph, Mrs. Peggy Griffin, Richard, John, Mrs. Alice Mertz, Vincent, and Mrs. Eleanor Newell. He also has 44 grandchildren and 13 great grandchildren.

He is a lifelong resident of the St. Louis area and has devoted much of his life in service to the Democratic Party, to his church, to the betterment of his community, and to his fellow man. Throughout his lifetime, he has been a great benefactor to people who were in need.

Currently, he is a retired member of Pipefitters Local 562. One of his proudest moments came in 1965 when he was honored by Missouri Gov. Warren E. Hearnes with an appointment as Honorary Colonel on the Governor's staff. He served in this capacity for 8 years.

On February 23, he will be celebrating his 80th birthday with his family and friends in St. Louis County.

I am proud to be the son of Melvin Young. He has served as an inspiration to me and to my brothers and sisters, as well as to his grandchildren and his great grandchildren. I hope that you will join me in wishing him a happy birthday.●

END SOUGHT TO EXPORT OF TECHNOLOGY TO SOVIETS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1982

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, "financially determined to close the barn door before all the horses are gone, the Reagan administration is now moving on many fronts to protect remaining U.S. secret techniques and skills." This is how Mr. Cord Meyer, a keen political observer, especially of intelligence-related matters, described the better-late-than-never response of the U.S. Government to stem the flow to the Soviet Union of American high technology—"bought, borrowed, and stolen." The details of the administration's concerns and its contemplated actions are worth reading. I reprint Mr. Meyer's column which appeared in the Baltimore Evening Sun, on January 15, 1982.

END SOUGHT TO EXPORT OF TECHNOLOGY TO SOVIETS

WASHINGTON.—The normally soft-spoken and cautious Adm. Bobby Inman, deputy director of the CIA, jolted a recent meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. He warned starkly that there would be a "tidal wave" of public outrage when upcoming congressional hearings reveal how the Soviets have bought, borrowed and stolen American high technology to establish their military advantage.

Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger has confessed this week that "our bureaucracy was asleep" while the Russians legally and illegally acquired the American technical secrets needed to build their own electronics industry for advanced weapons production.

Finally determined to close the barn door before all the horses are gone, the Reagan administration is now moving on many fronts to protect remaining U.S. secret techniques and skills. Building on the moral revulsion against the Soviet-directed crack-down in Poland, Reagan officials have selectively imposed sanctions on Russia that are designed to cut back sharply on future Soviet exploitation of American technology.

Not generally understood is the fact that the repression in Poland has acted as a catalyst within the Reagan administration. It has forced a clearcut decision not to sell American oil and gas technology to the Soviets to help them build the Yamal gas pipeline from Siberia to Western Europe.

By canceling the proposed sale to Russia by Caterpillar Tractor of heavy pipelaying equipment and by General Electric of compressor components, President Reagan has deliberately thrown a giant monkey wrench into Western European plans to lend the Soviets \$15 billion in return for access to Siberian gas. In the opinion of the experts, this decision to withhold the specialized equipment and engineering skills developed for use on Alaska's frozen tundra will cause prolonged delay in the Siberian project.

Moreover, Reagan officials have shown they mean business by warning our European allies to abide by their commitment in the NATO declaration "not to undermine the effect of each other's measures." By embargoing the sale of American oil and gas technology to the Russians and requesting the NATO allies and Japan not to substitute their equipment, Reagan is in effect signaling his determination to delay the pipeline even if it risks a major confrontation with West Germany, which has been counting on the pipeline not only for gas but for construction jobs and profits.

Under the Nixonian theory of detente, which Henry Kissinger used to articulate and in which Helmut Schmidt still apparently believes, Western trade and credits to Russia would entangle the Soviets in a web of mutual dependency and would lead to a gradual relaxation of tensions. As a Reagan official remarked, "The only people who got entangled was us," and the Polish events are seen as proof that the Soviets will not tolerate even modest reform. Repression in Poland destroyed not only Solidarity but also the rationale for the economics of detente.

In the shadow of Poland and Afghanistan, it seems suicidal folly for Western Europe to lend additional billions to the Soviets at low interest rates to build a Russian-owned pipeline that will make Europeans heavily dependent on Soviet goodwill for the price and quantity of their essential energy supplies. But even more disturbing to the Reagan administration than the danger of blackmail is

the pipeline's potential for vast Soviet earnings of hard currency derived from the sale of natural gas in Europe.

Instead of being forced in the mid 1980s to reallocate resources from their bloated military sector to civilian needs, the Soviets, if the pipelines goes through, will be able to bid high in Western Europe for the most advanced military technology. With Europeans dependent on a wide array of contracts and jobs connected with the pipeline, the Soviets will have the financial leverage to break any controls the Americans may have negotiated on the transfer of sensitive technology.

Secretary Weinberger speaks hopefully of what can be accomplished at the forthcoming meeting in Paris of the Coordinating Committee, the voluntary body of NATO countries and Japan that was set up in 1949 to prevent the flow of high technology to Russia. There are in fact specific American plans to broaden the list of technologies prohibited for sale to Russia and to improve the enforcement of procedures against cheating and evasion.●

A TRIBUTE TO THE JEANNETTE JAYHAWKS

HON. DON BAILEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1982

● Mr. BAILEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to extend official recognition to the 1981 Jeannette High School Football Team of Jeannette, Pa., for their outstanding achievement in becoming the Western Pennsylvania Interscholastic Athletic League Class "AA" Champions.

Their accomplishment is not only the result of their excellent athletic ability and proficiency, but is also reflective of first-class coaching, dedicated school interest and a community justly proud and supportive of its young people.

Individual recognition is given to each of the following who contributed to the team effort:

Members of the varsity squad are Mark Bibb, Joe Birk, Charlie Cook, Mike Cycak, Mario DelGross, Jim Graziano, Larry Hall, Roy Hall, Elmer Kramer, Frank Lago, Al Murtaza, Tom Powell, Joe Purpura, Mike Sarnelli, Ralph Scurci, Bob Wise, Joe Yorio, Vince Youngbauer, Tony Berry, Mike Blansett, Bob Cycak, John Demarchis, Dan Edwards, Tony Gummo, Dave Hajas, Ed Homchak, Rob Lapina, Clyde Parry, Frank Pitzer, Lance Tillman, Victor Waite, Chuck Blansett, Scott Boyles, Mark Brasco, Maurice Chamberlain, Tony Curtis, Rich Dopkosky, Randy Gelder, Vince Giquinto, Kirk Lago, Joe Loughner, Rich Miller, Bob Ohler, Al Rivardo, Mike Whatule, Dante Wiley. Managers: Ralph Caldin, Dan Cooper, Ed Pawlik, Cris Shank, and Marty Singer.

Head coach of the championship team is Joseph G. Mucci, and his as-

sistants are Paul Noonan, Art Traggesser, Robert Murphy, John Danton, William Stutz, and John Troglia.

Cheerleader sponsor is Kathleen Hartz. Cheerleaders: Sharon Deluzio, Sandra Yuhas, Terri Stevenson, Denise Emelo, Stacy Dreakford, Lori Slater, Amy DePalma, Judy Jones, Pam Terpko, Dena DeBridge, Gabrielle Baldasseroni, and Susie Weightman.

My congratulations to Principal William K. Burgun and his assistant, Donald A. Teti, of Jeannette High School. I share their pride in these outstanding young people who have exhibited the finest qualities of sportsmanship.●

WE SHALL NOT LOOK UPON HIS LIKE AGAIN

HON. DOUG BARNARD, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1982

● Mr. BARNARD. Mr. Speaker, our country is celebrating today the 250th birthday of our first President, George Washington. I have been pleased to see several recent articles that remind us not only of Washington the historic figure, but of George Washington the man.

I had planned this morning to make a long statement on the importance of Washington to our history and to today's United States. However, an article by Henry Fairlie sums up Washington's impact on us much better than I could have. He also stresses the importance of remembering that George Washington was a man, and not a marble statue that walked through our history.

Washington stands as a reminder to us of how an individual who believes in the public good can make a true difference in history. His greatness was not just due to his activities, but also to the fact of his humanity.

DON'T KNOCK GEORGE WASHINGTON: AS ABIGAIL SAID, "WE SHALL NOT LOOK UPON HIS LIKE AGAIN"

(By Henry Fairlie)

If asked whom I think was the greatest man who ever lived—meaning a man who by a combination of his own character, intelligence, force of will and abilities affected great affairs to the benefit of mankind—I would with little hesitation say that it was George Washington. Moreover, one means by such greatness that no other man of whom one can think could in his position have done so well.

One of the sillier judgments of Washington is that offered by a historian of deservedly slender reputation. Among the Founding Fathers, he wrote portentously, "Washington is not important, except as a symbol"; he was "one of those men whose great place in history is fortuitous." Stupid as this judgment is, it nonetheless clings at

the back of people's minds, as if Washington was just an accident.

The truth is rather in the judgment of one of the best of his biographers, James Thomas Flexner, who calls Washington, with no embarrassment, "the gentlest of history's great captains, one of the heroes of the human race." Or we may echo the tribute of Abigail Adams, who wrote to her son John Quincy after the Farewell Address: "Take his character together, and we shall not look upon his like again."

Let us consider this man of hot and even violent temper who, nevertheless, by what has rightly been called a prodigious and almost unique exercise of character, developed in himself, in the service of his country, such inexhaustible reserves of calm judgment and unflinching steadiness in action. No one can read of his life without realizing that there was a man who forged his character to meet his country's needs.

When Tom Paine visited the Continental Army in 1777, he said of Washington: "There is a natural firmness in some minds which cannot be unlocked by trifles, but which, when unlocked, discovers a cabinet of fortitude." But the firmness was not only natural. When one considers his early hot-headed conduct in the French and Indian Wars, one understands how resolutely over the years he wrought that "cabinet of fortitude" in himself.

At moments of great disturbance, he would retreat into silence. On being told in August 1775 that there was only enough powder for less than nine rounds a man, "for half an hour, he did not utter a word." Five years later, when his army was unpaid and starving, one of his generals wrote, "The great man is confounded at this situation, but appears to be reserved and silent." In those silences the indomitable will was forged.

Such fortitude is not made without a truth. All of Washington's early life was a preparation for his country's hour of need and his own destiny. He never went or wished to go to Europe. He only once briefly left continental America to go to the West Indies. From his earliest days as a stripling surveying the frontier, his eyes were always turned west to the huge land that beckoned with such promise.

Henrietta Liston, the wife of the British minister to the United States after 1796, said of him: "His first and last love appeared to be farming." She was not wrong. It has been said that his character can be read in the stones of Mount Vernon "as paleontologists deduce a dinosaur from inanimate bones." One need only go there to put in place the fripperies and gimmicks of Monticello.

Monticello is foreign. Mount Vernon is American. The first time that an American walked me into its grounds 17 years ago, I took one look at the house and then the land that stretches so green and far in front of it and said: "Now I know what you Americans were fighting for—you wanted this!" Most of Washington's life was an unending sacrifice of the familiar pleasures he found at Mount Vernon.

The farmer's love of the land merged into an attraction to nature which "amounted to love." Not only did he become a devotee of landscape painting, but the only paintings other than portraits which he bought were American views. Washington did not find his image of America in abstract principles or political tracts. He left those to others. His sense of America sprang from the ground beneath his feet, and burned in the

blue-gray eyes that gazed so long and so lovingly on the waiting land.

He had a passion for acreage. As soon as the British had cleared the French out to the north, he said that a gentleman would be out of his mind if he did not scavenge for land. When he prepared his last will, he made a list of his evaluated landholdings, and came to the total of \$488,137, several millions in today's currency. But in his passion for acreage was also a vision of a country yet to be made.

What was common to his leadership as a general and his statesmanship as a president was this sense of a continent that could and must be forged into a nation. From the moment that he took command, he wanted an army that represented more than one region, that was indeed a Continental Army. He threatened with punishment "any officers or soldiers so lost to virtue and a love of their country" as to engage in regional quarrels.

The principle that he pursued as president was already laid down by him as a general in 1780: "Unless the states will content themselves with a full and well-chosen representation in Congress, and vest that body with absolute powers in all matters relative to the great purposes of war and of general concern . . . we are attempting an impossibility and very soon shall become (if it is not already the case) a many-headed monster, a heterogeneous mass, that never will steer to the same point." He would today have questioned the "new federalism."

As the army was disbanded in 1783, he wrote that he intended "taking a more contemplative and extensive view of the vast inland navigation of these United States. . . . I shall not rest contented till I have explored the Western country and traversed those lines (or a great part of them) which have given bounds to a New Empire." Of all the Founding Fathers he was by far the most American. His country was the caked mud on his boots.

It is said that he saved his country twice, as general and then as president, and of course there is much truth in that salute. Yet it must not make us overlook the consistency of the vision that directed him in both roles. In his sense of the continent was the truth that forged the will, and nourished the reserves of calm and steadiness. He was not made great by the time in which he acted; he made himself great enough to meet the time.

This is not the place to catalogue either the scores of times when one simply does not believe that any other general, not even Napoleon himself, could have so inspired and brilliantly led such a ragamuffin army of ill-paid and ill-shod and ill-tempered troops; or the equal number of times when as president he guided the new country through the treacherous shoals of personal ambitions and partisan bitterness.

Any man who could hold the ship of state on course when he was surrounded by men such as Jefferson and Adams and Hamilton—to mention only the most prominent, and by no means the most awkward—indeed earns him the title of a consummate statesman and the Father of his Country. Nothing is more painful to read in his whole life than his unwilling arrival at the conclusion, at the time of Jay's Treaty, that no other than a friend and a Virginian in the person of Edmund Randolph had betrayed him. Yet he did not shirk the truth.

When one considers only the nuts and bolts of the presidency as he first made it in two difficult terms, one finds so much with

which he had first to experiment and almost always did so with a sure hand. From his conduct of his cabinet to the use of the presidential veto, and in scores of other ways, he made the presidency, in the atmosphere of the 18th century, a strong (but not autocratic) and modern institution.

Painting him, Gilbert Stuart wrote: "All his features were indicative of the strongest passions, yet, like Socrates, his judgment and self-command made him appear of a different cast in the eyes of the world. . . . Had he been born in the forests . . . he would have been the fiercest man among the savage tribes." From youth to maturity, through as hard a life as any man has chosen for the good of others, the picture is the same.

In 1780, the French officer and courtier, Count Axel de Fersen, on meeting Washington, said: "He looks the hero." So indeed he does—the more so, the more we know of him—even reading now his own eloquent, vehement, but always measured words. For a man who had little schooling, he had a commanding speech that astonishes. Yet the final tribute is that, hero as he was, we think of him first as only human. A man like us—a hero.

That is why he is greater than Alexander or Caesar or Napoleon; it is also why no plays are written about him.●

FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1982

● Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, this is National Future Farmers of America Week. FFA is a national student organization, designed to enhance the education of boys and girls ages 14-21 preparing for careers in vocational agriculture. Organized in 1928, FFA now has almost 500,000 members in 8,233 chapters across the United States, and membership continues to grow.

This year, the theme for the week is Vocational Agriculture—Growing for America. Certainly farming is one of our Nation's most important industries. Today, farmers know that all Americans depend on their judgment. The Future Farmers of America are to be commended for their personal efforts to follow in the footsteps of those men and women who have helped build our country.

These students who wear the blue jacket with the gold insignia are some of America's finest. FFA'ers grow individually by learning how to speak in public, participating in educational projects, and solving their own problems. Vocational agriculture students learn about everything from beekeeping to farm management computer programs. With a minimum of supervision, FFA members work to make their community a better place in which to live. These young men and women are developing valuable skills

which they will be able to use in any career.

Farming has become increasingly more complex during the last century. A farmer must be a combination businessman, economist, mechanic, chemist, and meteorologist. The Future Farmers of America face a large responsibility, because the next generations will rely on the improvements in agriculture made today. I am thankful that these young people are not afraid to accept this challenge, and I would like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to each and every one of these outstanding young men and women. ●

LEGISLATIVE VETO

HON. TRENT LOTT

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1982

● Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, the question of whether Congress should have authority to block certain Executive actions by simple or concurrent resolutions is very much in the news lately. This week, the Supreme Court hears oral arguments on the constitutionality of the legislative veto in the immigration law in the case of *Chadha* against INS. A month ago, a three-judge panel for the U.S. court of appeals here held the legislative veto unconstitutional in the Natural Gas Policy Act, and implied that all legislative veto provisions not requiring Presidential involvement were unconstitutional. This session, the House and Senate will be considering regulatory reform legislation which will include consideration of amendments to permit one or both Houses to disapprove proposed regulations. One such proposal, H.R. 1776, introduced by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEVITAS), now has 250 House cosponsors.

As a cosponsor of the Levitas bill and the author of a proposed compromise, H.R. 4838, "The Regulatory Control Act of 1981," I remain strongly convinced that a generic legislative veto provision for regulations is both desirable and constitutional. I am especially persuaded by the reasoning of the U.S. Court of Claims in upholding the constitutionality of the legislative veto in the Federal Salary Act in the case of *Atkins v. the United States*. That court held the veto was constitutional because it was within the necessary and proper clause authority and that vetoes did not violate the presentation clause of the Constitution because they neither made new law nor amended existing law: they preserve the status quo. This same argument was advanced in a Rules subcommittee print issued by Chairman MOAKLEY in the last Congress, even though Chair-

man MOAKLEY opposes such vetoes from a practical standpoint.

Mr. Speaker, the Sunday, February 21, Washington Post carried an excellent article on the legislative veto by Dr. Louis Fisher, a senior specialist in American government at the Library of Congress and preeminent scholar and author on Presidential-congressional relations. Dr. Fisher approaches the prospect that such vetoes may be declared unconstitutional from the perspective of how this may alter relations between the branches. Contrary to conventional thinking that the veto gives Congress too much power and that its elimination would help restore the balance between the branches, Dr. Fisher argues quite convincingly that Congress may tighten the screws on the Executive in more cumbersome and inhibiting ways if it is stripped of the veto authority.

There are now some 272 legislative veto provisions in 193 statutes. Most of these have been worked out as a matter of comity between the branches in order to allow the President the authority and flexibility of action which Congress might not otherwise grant without the veto authority. This authority not only covers certain regulations, but such major matters as foreign arms sales, the war powers act, and Presidential impoundment authority.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD, I include Dr. Fisher's article and commend it to the reading of my colleagues. The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 21, 1982]

CONGRESS CAN'T LOSE ON ITS VETO POWER

(By Louis Fisher)

We are witnessing an ironic turn in the historic struggle between the executive branch and Congress: a court decision which seemingly promises much greater power for the executive but which, if upheld, would likely lead to the opposite effect.

The Jan. 29 ruling, by a three-judge panel of the U.S. Court of Appeals here, gave a rude jolt to the "legislative veto," a device Congress has relied on for at least a half century to control executive actions.

Specifically, the panel struck down a one-house veto used to disapprove a gas-pricing regulation by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). But its language was so broad as to question the constitutionality of legislative vetoes in hundreds of other laws governing arms sales, immigration, war powers, impoundment, endless agency regulations and much else.

The D.C. panel recognized that its finding—that all legislative acts constitutionally require "presentation to the president and passage by both houses of Congress"—"may have far-reaching effects on the operation of the national government." But it may have misunderstood those effects.

Many assume the ruling portends a gain for the executive branch, a victory for orderly government, a blow to congressional interference. Think again. If the Supreme Court upholds the overly broad opinion, the net result will more likely be less power for executive officials, a more convoluted legislative process, and continued congressional involvement in administrative decisions.

Bizarre consequences? Not if you understand why the legislative veto was originally adopted. Presidents accepted (indeed, often invited) legislative vetoes because they provided a way to get more power. The bargain was clearly understood by both branches. The president essentially told Congress: "Give me more authority than you normally would, and I'll give you a chance to veto my initiatives." If presidents disliked the legislative veto, Congress would withhold authority.

Courts are familiar with this quid pro quo. In 1977 the Fourth Circuit dismissed a suit by a federal employee who protested that the Senate acted unconstitutionally when it disapproved a pay raise recommended by the president. But the legislative history convinced the court that Congress delegated the salary authority only on condition that it could, by a one-house veto, disapprove presidential recommendations. The authority and the condition were inseparable.

The FERC case was different. Here the court decided that the grant of rulemaking authority was not tied explicitly to the one-house veto. But that is the exception, not the rule.

The record shows, for example, that the president could not tell Congress: "Thanks very much for the authority to reorganize the executive branch, but I have no intention of recognizing your right to veto my plans." Executive reorganization power and the legislative veto could not be severed.

Other examples abound. Under the Impoundment Control Act of 1974, the president may defer spending unless one house of Congress disapproves. The president is not at liberty to take the authority and ignore the condition. If the legislative veto is unconstitutional, the president will forfeit the statutory authority to defer spending.

He might claim other authorities (statutory or implied powers under the Constitution), but this would merely trigger the kind of fractious litigation we had in the early 1970s under President Nixon.

The Federal Trade Commission Act of 1980 raises a similar issue. Congress, angered by some FTC regulations, enacted legislation requiring future rules to run the gauntlet of the legislative veto. If the D.C. panel's opinion is upheld, the FTC may lose its authority under the statute to issue regulations.

Uncertainties in this area, as in others, would probably force more issues into the courts, with the preponderance of evidence often on the side of the Congress. In the laws covering arms sales, foreign trade, the sale of nuclear fuel, federal salaries, immigration, impoundment and presidential papers, for some notable examples, the delegated power and the legislative veto seems inseparable.

Congress, of course, could rewrite many of its broad delegations of power, and the executive branch also could well lose some procedural benefits. Where there is a legislative veto, presidential proposals are put on a fast-track system. Other privileges include special procedures to by-pass committees, limit debate and prohibit floor amendments. Without the legislative veto, Congress would eliminate these advantages or require the president to gain approval of both houses in a bill or joint resolution. Either approach would undercut the president.

The legislative veto is criticized as a backdoor way of accomplishing what should be done directly through the regular legislative process. But if Congress is denied the legislative veto, no one should underestimate its

ingenuity in inventing other devices that will be more cumbersome for the president and just as satisfactory to Congress.

President Eisenhower discovered this unpleasant fact in the 1950s when he objected to "committee vetoes" compelling agencies to obtain advance clearance from congressional panels. Attorney General Herbert Brownell called this an unconstitutional infringement on executive responsibility.

Undaunted, Congress created another procedure that yielded the same control. A bill was drafted to prohibit appropriations for certain real estate transactions unless the Public Works committees first approved the contracts. Eisenhower signed the bill after Brownell concluded that this procedure—based on the authorization-appropriation process—was within Congress' power. The form had changed; the committee veto remained.

If the one-house veto over impoundment deferrals is invalid, Congress will have no trouble devising more burdensome procedures for the president. A harbinger of what might be in the works appears in the Transportation Appropriation Act for fiscal 1982, passed last December. Whenever the president proposes to defer appropriations for various rail programs, the funds must be released unless Congress within 45 days completes action on a bill approving all or part of the proposed deferral.

There is no constitutional problem here, since Congress will act through the regular legislative process. Yet in this case, in effect, the president not only ends up with a one-house veto but a more onerous version. Under the Impoundment Control Act, one house must take the initiative to disapprove a deferral. Under the transportation statute one house can succeed through inaction.

There are other anomalies. Opponents of the legislative veto warn about the workload imposed on Congress by having to review administrative actions. But the workload is likely to be far heavier if Congress has to act positively through the regular process. The temptation will be strong for Congress to grant powers for shorter periods, forcing the president to return to Congress for extensions. Of course either house, by inaction, could deny him the authority.

Other mechanisms are also available to protect congressional prerogatives. Under the Trade Act of 1958, the president could implement certain actions for import relief only by obtaining from Congress a concurrent resolution passed by a two-thirds majority in both houses. Courts would likely find this type of concurrent resolution unconstitutional, since it contains a built-in override of a presidential veto. This would come as little consolation to a president forced to locate an extraordinary majority in each house before acting.

The D.C. court, in its FERC ruling, warned that the legislative veto enables Congress "to expand its role from one of oversight, with an eye to legislative revision, to one of shared administration." This increase in congressional power, according to the court, violates the separation-of-powers doctrine.

But with or without the legislative veto, Congress will remain knee-deep in administrative decisions, and it is inconceivable that any court or any president can prevent this. Call it supervision, intervention, interference or plain meddling, Congress will find a way.

If an agency adopts a regulation that offends Congress, legislators can attach language to an appropriation bill preventing

the use of funds to implement the regulation. There is no constitutional question about Congress' right to do this, although riders to appropriations bills are far from ideal ways to make law. They are added without the hearings, careful consideration and substantive knowledge that more likely accompany a legislative veto.

Congress also exercises an extraordinary array of non-statutory controls. The clearest examples are the understandings between Congress and the agencies for "reprogramming"; the shifting of funds from one program to another with the same appropriation account. Major reprogrammings must be approved by the committees (or subcommittees) with jurisdiction over the program.

This is simply one more quid pro quo between the branches. In return for the flexibility of lump-sum appropriations, agencies agree to abide by reprogramming guidelines and committee clearance. No one wants to return to line-item funding. Since this type of control is informal and nonstatutory, it is difficult to conceive of a legal issue that might reach the courts. But the involvement of Congress in "shared administration" is just as real and binding.

Judicial warnings about shared administration seem unrealistic in view of the extensive overlay of statutory and nonstatutory controls. Certainly it is extravagant and hyperbolic for the D.C. Circuit to suggest that legislative vetoes put us on the road to congressional tyranny. If the courts are serious about "untangling" the rights and powers of the three branches, they have their work cut out.

Shall they prohibit the president from making substantive legislation through executive orders and proclamations? Will courts resurrect the 1935 rule requiring Congress to delegate legislative power with clear standards? This would be a revolution in itself. Should we consider placing all independent commissions under the executive departments, thereby tidying up the system of three branches? This has been tried more than once, without success, and for good reason. Can we no longer tolerate adjudication and "quasi-legislation" by the agencies? Should we eliminate "legislative courts" (established under Congress' Article I powers)? For that matter, is it time to ask the courts to pull back from their own involvement in legislation and administration?

It is too glib for courts to tell Congress that if it disagrees with what the president and the agencies are doing, it should act through the regular legislative process. The regular process is subject to a president's veto, creating the need for a two-third majority in each house to override the president. Without the legislative veto, Congress is placed in the dilemma of delegating authority by a majority vote and then needing a two-thirds majority to recapture control. That is why both branches agreed on the legislative veto for reorganization authority.

The legislative veto in the War Powers Resolution of 1973 was meant to extricate Congress from the situation it found itself in under President Nixon: able to attract a majority vote in each house to deny funding for the Vietnam war, but unable to secure a two-thirds vote when Nixon vetoed these restrictions. Critics of the legislative veto have not addressed this problem.

Nor is it enough to advise Congress that legislative vetoes would be unnecessary if it would only delegate with precise standards and clear policy.

Congress has no doubt used the legislative veto to side step difficult questions of na-

tional policy; it can be a convenient and irresponsible substitute for making legislative decisions. But the veto allows Congress to review specific proposals under circumstances that no one could foresee when the authority was first delegated.

For many issues facing government today, the legislative veto is practical, appropriate and constitutional. Striking it down is not a step to be taken lightly.●

"PLEASE 'EM WITH PORK" WINNERS SALUTED

HON. COOPER EVANS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1982

● Mr. EVANS of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, my home State of Iowa has long been the leader in the Nation's production of pork. People think of Iowa and almost immediately think of hogs. On our farms we have a warm regard for those often abused critters which have provided us so well by giving their all.

When our forefathers left their homeland and came to America in a steady convoy of fragile ships, it was often salt pork which provided the needed sustenance for those aboard ship well in advance of refrigeration even in its most primitive form.

As the colonists headed west to homestead this great Nation of ours, sturdy hogs accompanied the wagon trains. Once those homesteaders established their claims, the hogs grew to maturity, in many cases on a diet of waste and scraps from the family kitchen.

Here in Washington, even in those early days, the hog began to claim prominence. The menu for the second inauguration of President Lincoln featured roast pork. Even today, in the House restaurant, the "Iowa chop" is featured as one of the very best meals served in our Nation's Capitol.

The mighty hog has often been severely maligned with unkind and degrading terms such as "pigheaded," "clumsy as a pig on ice," "fat as a pig," or "male chauvinist pig," when over the years he has been the source of low-cost nutrition. Across the Corn Belt, the hog has been the "lifter of the mortgage" on thousands of farms.

In recent years, we have all seen the popular picture of two hogs nuzzling called "Hogs Are Beautiful." And they really are when they are returning a profit. That has not been the case for many months, but recent improvement in prices is bringing a few smiles in our farming community.

Another activity has been taking place to boost pork prices. Here in the Washington-Baltimore area, the Rath Packing Co., the major processor of hogs in Iowa, has been working closely with the Giant Foods supermarket chain on an outstanding merchandis-

ing program. Called "Please 'Em With Iowa Pork," the promotion has been conducted under the sponsorship of the Iowa Pork Producers Council. It has resulted in the meat department managers of Giant Foods stores in this area going whole hog in displaying to its best sales advantage Iowa pork processed by Rath Packing.

Through this project, many residents of the Capital metropolitan area have been introduced to this top quality product for the first time. We hope they continue to enjoy our Iowa pork.

It was my privilege earlier this month to share in honoring meat department managers of six Giant Foods stores for excellence in this promotional effort. The contest among these Giant staff people has been completed. The award recipients have been selected. They received well-deserved recognition at a banquet held in their honor.

The winners in the "Please 'Em With Iowa Pork" contest are, really, all who enjoy this fine product. But the winners of the merchandising awards are: Richard Phillips, Arlington, Va., meat department manager of the Giant store in Alexandria; William Sink, Silver Spring, Md., meat department manager in Bethesda; Larry Guman, Sterling Park, Va., meat department manager in Sterling; Cliff Frank, Bowie, Md., meat department manager in Upper Marlboro; Vernon Tebo, Pasadena, Md., meat department manager in Glen Burnie; and Bill Winters, Glen Burnie, meat department manager in Reisterstown, Md.

It is a privilege to salute these men for their accomplishment.●

BWI—THE BETTER ALTERNATIVE

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1982

● Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, for nearly two decades, a public policy debate has raged over the future operation of Washington National Airport. Maryland citizens residing near National, by virtue of high levels of aircraft noise and congestion, have been held hostage to that airport's continuing overutilization. The Metropolitan Washington airports policy, announced last year by the Secretary of Transportation, represents an important first step in efforts to achieve a more balanced utilization of the three air carrier airports serving the Washington metropolitan area.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I said three airports, because, while most of the sound and fury has been aimed at National and Dulles, there has been another airport, ready and waiting to be

recognized as one of our area's premier airports.

Baltimore-Washington International Airport (BWI) has long been considered by the Civil Aeronautics Board as well as the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments as part of the solution to National Airport's environmental and capacity limitations.

BWI has undergone a comprehensive and exciting refurbishment and expansion program, making it one of the most modern, safe, and convenient airports in the world. Just last summer, the Department of Transportation opened the BWI Amtrak Station, creating an intermodal system that brings BWI within 30 minutes of downtown Washington. For many people living in the Maryland suburbs, it is as convenient as National, and much more convenient than Dulles.

In the 10 years since BWI has been owned by the State of Maryland, it has built a substantial following among passengers for its convenience—offering short, medium, and long range and connecting service not only within the confines of the United States, but also to London, Frankfurt, Montreal, and Mexico.

In light of the proposed reduction in funding for National and Dulles, I think it only appropriate to underscore at this time, the tremendous opportunity we have to become boosters of BWI. BWI is ready, willing, and more than able to serve the Washington metropolitan community.●

THE (SAM) BROWNING OF VISTA

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1982

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, history will record the Carter administration as the last desperate throw of the dice by the New Left in its effort to impose radical social views on the United States. New Leftists, such as radical Sam Brown, and his aide, Marge Tabankin, took over the ACTION Agency under Jimmy Carter and proceeded to transform it into a transmission belt for the delivery of tax-supported programs to New Left radical activist organizations. This disgrace was silently watched—or cheered—by the very ones who are screaming because President Reagan is instituting much needed reforms in social programs.

At this time, I wish to insert in the record, "The New Left in Government; The VISTA Program as 'Institution-Building,'" an executive summary study of a Heritage Foundation report, January 1982.

THE NEW LEFT IN GOVERNMENT: PART II—THE VISTA PROGRAM AS "INSTITUTION-BUILDING"

VISTA "is probably one of the few government agencies established in the '60s which is both fondly remembered by the Left and still staffed by leftists." This was the assessment of "Mother Jones," a magazine published by the Foundation for National Progress, referring to a June 1980 Washington, D.C., conference commemorating the fifteenth anniversary of Volunteers in Service to America, originally part of President Lyndon Johnson's "War on Poverty." That the journal of a foundation created in 1975 by the far-left Institute for Policy Studies should so characterize VISTA says much about the redirection of the agency during the Carter Administration under the leadership of two principal New Left activists, Sam Brown and Margery Tabankin. It also helps explain both the Reagan Administration's reported decision to phase out the program entirely by the close of fiscal 1983 and the widely-held perception of VISTA as a program which, from 1977 through 1980, was captured by New Left radical activists and used to funnel government funds to organizations advocating programs and strategies basically antithetical to American political and economic usages.

It was Brown's view that federal anti-poverty efforts had tended to degenerate into programs that encouraged dependency rather than "self-help" and that what was needed was a renewed emphasis on "citizen participation." Tabankin's view coincided with Brown's. Stressing the need to develop "institution-building" and "networking" at the local level through community organizing programs based on the nationwide network of radical organizations from which activists like Brown and herself had emerged, Tabankin said that "VISTA should work towards more equitable distribution of income and opportunities."

The result was the national grants program, whereby grants were awarded by ACTION headquarters to national organizations with affiliates in local communities without restrictions imposed by state or regional boundaries. These grants were to be used "in support of citizen participation organization building efforts and the creation/expansion of advocacy systems" rather than for any "direct service for the sake of service (i.e., the end goal is to provide a service)." As noted in the March/April 1978 issue of "Working Papers for a New Society," another IPS-related publication, "this procedure shielded the agency's new direction from the public eye for a while—an important strategy, as later become apparent."

The national grants program emerged from a lengthy "citizen review process" initiated early in 1977. Tabankin appears to have played an especially important role in this process and acknowledged that she had "make up the list" of those who should be invited to participate in a series of roundtable discussions held by VISTA in May and June of 1977. By ACTION's own account, the national grants concept "envolved" from these meetings, in which 100 organizations were represented, among them the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN), Campaign for Economic Democracy, Federation of Southern Cooperatives, Laurel Springs Training Center, Midwest Academy, National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs, and National Training and Information Center. Of these,

at least five—ACORN, FSC, MA, NCUEA, and NTIC—were among the first twelve recipients of national grants (ACORN benefiting through the Community Organizations Research and Action Project, which the ACORN leadership created specifically to handle VISTA funds). Another recipient was the Youth Project, a leftist funding agency for which Tabankin had worked as executive director.

One regional ACTION director was quoted as characterizing national grants as "Marge Tabankin's program and all her cronies." As summarized by Representative John M. Ashbrook (R-Ohio), "Of the 22 organizations represented at the meetings with which Ms. Tabankin claimed some prior association [exclusive of the Youth Project], 13 ended up as beneficiaries under the National VISTA Grants program." The leadership of these organizations, among them Michael Ansara of Massachusetts Fair Share and Heather Booth of the Midwest Academy, had in many cases been active in groups like Students for a Democratic Society and in annual conferences conducted by an IPS offshoot known as the National Conference on Alternative State and Local Public Policies, one of several IPS projects funded in part by Tabankin's Youth Project.

Subsequently-uncovered abuses in the operation of the national grants program included the use of volunteers in restricted staff-related work, union organizing, and political activity. Under the ACORN/CORAP grant, VISTAs engaged in blatantly political activity in Arkansas and Missouri, while five VISTAs were active in a labor organizing campaign in New Orleans. In like manner, under the Midwest Academy grant, two VISTAs worked virtually full-time in Rhode Island in labor organizing among jewelry workers. Training materials had to be withdrawn from use by both CORAP and Midwest because of "intemperate" and excessively confrontational language.

National grantees were not the only organizations of a radical hue to benefit under the new program. Sponsoring organizations like the Illinois Public Action Council, Cleveland Women Working, the California Housing Action and Information Network, and the Institute for the Study of Civic Values also received assistance. Both CWW and CHAIN have been actively represented at "Alternative Public Policy" gatherings staged by NCASLPP or CED; and IPAC, working through a subsidiary known as the Illinois Coalition Against Reagan Economics (ICARE), mounted a demonstration in Chicago during July 1981 to protest an appearance by President Reagan. The Institute for the Study of Civic Values, which was represented at a July 1977 NCASLPP conference, recently produced "The Cruelty Index—A Guide to Reagan Budget Cuts" and "The Greed Index—A Guide to Reagan Tax Reductions."

Recently-discovered documentary material reveals that a major training contract was awarded in August 1978 to the Laurel Springs Institute, self-described as a project of a Campaign for Economic Democracy enterprise known as the Laurel Springs Educational Center. As far back as May 5, 1977, Tom Hayden wrote to Tabankin, "We want a voice in the training of VISTAs in California and the definition of their work." The CED staff employee recommended to Tabankin by Hayden was among those later invited to the roundtable meetings.

Laurel Springs Educational Center was specifically designed to train activists "in

the fields of electoral campaigning and community organizing" and to enable participants to "learn more about the way our economic and political systems operate and what CED's alternatives are." It was also designed, in the words of Hayden's wife, Jane Fonda, to aid CED in "building a political power base." It is therefore not altogether surprising that assessments of certain VISTA-related LSI programs written by ACTION officials have emphasized that CED and LSI were virtually indistinguishable, that project meetings were dominated by extraneous CED business, or that VISTAs were pressured to attend CED meetings unrelated to their projects. Of the eleven staff members and consultants originally proposed by LSI, no fewer than nine had been actively involved in CED, frequently in leadership capacities.

Laurel Springs training material was pronouncedly New Left in content. It included a training manual issued by the Midwest Academy and a resource list recommending publications of such organizations as the CED-related California Public Policy Center and an SDS offshoot known as the North American Congress on Latin America. Past workshops dealt with such subjects as "An Overview of Electoral Strategy in Relation To Community Organizing" and a "discussion of the meaning of Economic Democracy as it relates to community organizing." The propriety of government support for such a radical political apparatus is open to serious question, but it may be that the machinery of VISTA itself must be changed if similar abuses under future Sam Browns and Marge Tabankins are to be prevented.●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1982

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent for recorded votes on Tuesday, February 9, 1982, and on Wednesday, February 10, 1982.

Had I been present on February 9, 1982, I would have voted:

"Yea" on rollcall No. 5, passage of House Joint Resolution 392, making an emergency supplemental appropriation for the Department of Health and Human Services for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1982, to meet low-income energy assistance obligations; and

"Yea" on rollcall No. 6, passage of House Joint Resolution 391, making an urgent supplemental appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1982, to meet unemployment benefits and employment services obligations.

Had I been present on February 10, 1982, I would have voted:

"Yea" on rollcall No. 7, final passage of H.R. 4481, the Justice Assistance Act of 1982; and

"Yea" on rollcall No. 8, House agreement to the Senate low-income energy assistance amendment to House Joint Resolution 389, making an urgent supplemental appropriation for the fiscal

year ending September 30, 1982, for the Department of Agriculture.●

EASING ACCESS TO FEDERAL PROCUREMENT INFORMATION FOR SMALL BUSINESS

HON. PARREN J. MITCHELL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1982

● Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation designed to ease access to Federal procurement information for the small business person. Small businesses, though 97 percent of this Nation's business, are severely disadvantaged in their ability to compete for Government contracts and in fact received only 22.2 percent of Government procurement opportunities in 1980. This disadvantage is caused, in large part, by defective notice procedures regarding contracting opportunities.

The Commerce Business Daily is the vehicle through which the Small Business Act requires the publication of Federal contracting opportunities. Federal agencies wishing to procure a good or service must publish their proposed bids or solicitations in this publication. The act reasoned that in this manner, maximum competition for Government contracts would be assured. However, I have found this to be far from the reality. I believe that the legislation I am introducing today will initiate the process we will later undertake to make the Commerce Business Daily more responsive to the needs of small businesses in this country.

It is administrative practice to publish procurement notices in the Commerce Business Daily 10 days before a solicitation is issued. Yet, it is just as likely that the first notice of a procurement appears on the date a solicitation is issued. Also, present regulations require a minimum bidding time of 20 calendar days, except where there are "special circumstances" or an "urgent need" for the goods or services. As a result, the 30 days optimally designed for solicitation and bidding processes exists only at the discretion of the procuring agency and is often shortened. It is because this time period is prescribed by regulation and not statute, that I intend to introduce a series of changes to better protect small business interests.

Mr. Speaker, the bill I am introducing today would give small businesses 15 days from the appearance of a notice in the Commerce Business Daily to request copies of a solicitation. An additional 30 days from the issuance of the solicitation would be offered before bids are due. These 45 days would afford small firms the time

to monitor the publication and prepare a bid or proposal. Without creating additional costs for the Commerce Business Daily, this bill will aid small firms in developing their capacity to do business with the Federal Government and will begin the process of simplification of contracting procedures. ●

CORRECTING A TARIFF AMBIGUITY

HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1982

● Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce legislation to correct a tariff ambiguity which has brought trade difficulties to importers of entertainment broadcast band clock radios.

This bill creates a new tariff provision for entertainment broadcast band clock radios—except for those dedicated to use as automotive equipment—and thereby resolves an ambiguity relating to the proper classification of clock radios. This is done by segregating clock radios from other types of radio receivers. The bill provides for duty-free treatment of the radio component of the article, but the separate duty assessment on clock "movements" is not addressed and will not be affected by passage of this legislation.

The proposed bill provides that clock radios imported from non-Communist countries will be eligible for duty-free entry on entries made on or after 90 days prior to the date of enactment. There is no U.S. manufacturer of clock radios as classified under this legislation.

This legislation is needed to clearly define the classification of clock radios. Differing interpretations as to the proper classification have existed for many years and are traceable in part to revisions of the tariff schedules applicable to various types of radios over the years. While many types of radios have been specifically provided for, clock radios have not been.

Importers have been subjected to excessive duties on clock radios since at least the early 1970's. During this period, total duties paid by importers whose protests have been disallowed are believed to be in excess of \$15,000,000 above what would have been paid under a classification the importers have to date unsuccessfully sought. The bill, in part, is designed to remedy this situation, although it does not provide for refund of duties paid more than 90 days prior to the date of enactment.

The volume of clock radio imports has increased significantly in recent years, while domestic production is nonexistent. Therefore, this bill would

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

benefit the consumer by offsetting inflationary pressures on clock radio prices, and at the same time would not harm U.S. industry.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1982

● Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, this 64th anniversary of the Lithuanian Independence Day is being commemorated at a time when the world is focusing its attention on the repressed peoples living in East European nations which have been subjugated by the Soviet Union.

Although the troubles of Poland are now in the limelight, we should take this occasion to remember the other proud peoples which have been the object of repression for decades.

The nation of Lithuania has time and again fought for its independence, first against Russian and German occupation, and now, against Soviet hegemony.

It is with great pleasure that I join my colleagues in observing February 16, 1981, as the 64th anniversary of the declaration of independence by Lithuania.

On February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian nation declared its independence; a goal these people had sought during a period of Russian domination from 1795 to 1915, followed by German occupation during the First World War.

Twenty years later, Lithuania fell under Russian domination when it was occupied by the Red army in World War II, and declared a constituent Republic of the U.S.S.R. on August 3, 1940. Following the German attack on the Soviet Union 10 months later, Lithuania was occupied by Germany until it was reoccupied by the Soviet Army in 1944.

While theoretically and legally defined as a sovereign state, Lithuania has in fact been dominated and exploited by the Soviet Union for well over half a century. The Soviet policies being carried out against the Lithuanian people since then have resulted in a quasi-Russified satellite.

The number of Lithuanian schools, newspapers, and other publications has greatly declined. Russian, not Lithuanian, is the official language.

Those government and/or party officials who occupy the true seats of power are great Russian, not Lithuanian.

In the face of this brutal Russification, however, the Lithuanian people have not lost hope. They have held fast to their principles of self-determination and love of freedom. Despite the Soviet control of their media, we

in the West sporadically received word of incidents in Lithuania, and the other Baltic nations of Estonia and Latvia, which prove that Soviet policies have failed.

Demonstrations and protests against their Soviet type economy and repressive government continue to this day.

We only have to witness the Soviet fear of the spread of unrest and liberalising trends in Poland, evidenced by the December crackdown and attempted silencing of events there, to know this is true.

Mr. Speaker, today I wish you and my other colleagues here to join me in the sincere hope that the near future will bring true freedom to the Lithuanian people. We must continue to support their efforts in seeking independence, and never swerve from our policy of non-recognition of the Soviets' forced annexation of the proud nation of Lithuania. ●

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. CARDISS COLLINS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1982

● Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of pride and hope that I rise to speak to you today. Sixty four years ago, the Republic of Lithuania was established, a momentous first day in what should have been a long-lasting era for that Baltic nation; 22 years later, in 1940, that small republic was crushed by the tanks and armies of the Soviet Union. We can all empathize with the many oppressed Lithuanians living under the Russian boot, as well as the anguish of friends and families in this country who have not seen their loved ones for so many years.

The plight of any subjugated people is an injustice that deeply concerns all of us. The brave men and women of Afghanistan who struggle to oust a hated Soviet puppet regime; the Polish workers and farmers who seek dignity in their work and a voice in their future; all reminds us of our own past, and reconfirms our resolve to aid those who yearn to be free of foreign domination.

I share the pride and hope of all Lithuanian Americans on this special day, and assure all of them that we will not forget February 17, 1918. ●

WORLD FREEDOM DAY

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1982

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, a very significant letter to the editor by Prof. Anthony Kubek, of the Troy State University, has just been called to my attention and I wish to share it with my colleagues. It concerns the subject of freedom, a subject which Americans have to be concerned with 365 days a year. The subject is World Freedom Day, which was observed on January 24. Mr. Kubek particularly reminds us of the North Korean and Chinese Communist prisoners who chose not to return to their Communist-dominated homelands after the Korean war. I commend the letter to the thoughtful consideration of my colleagues.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

(By Dr. Anthony Kubek)

We read and hear a lot today about the significance of observing anniversaries of important Americans. Beyond birthdays of individuals who represented great movements, there is another day in this winter season which deserves to be remembered. Permit a professor of international relations to call attention to January 24, World Freedom Day.

On this date back in 1954, some 22,000 North Korean and Chinese Communist prisoners-of-war refused "repatriation" behind the Bamboo Curtain. Resolutely ignoring all enticements and intimidations, these brave Asians turned their backs on totalitarianism and marched out to freedom.

The Republic of China, on the island of Taiwan, received 14,000 of these freedom-seekers and, in the past 28 years, at least 170,000 more Chinese have fled from Communism on the mainland. In addition to the hundreds of thousands of boat people who have left Communist-controlled Indo-China in the last few years, a total of about 12 million Asians have fled from totalitarianism since 1954. This is how people, denied a voice and a ballot, vote with the soles of their feet.

World Freedom Day commemorates the human dignity, courage and aspirations of captive peoples everywhere behind Communist curtains today—in Asia, Africa, Afghanistan, Cuba and Central America, Poland and Eastern Europe, and the Soviet Union itself. To those who insist that whatever happens inside any country is an internal matter, we Americans should say "Nuts!" just as General McAuliffe said to the Nazi commander at Bastogne. We, who live behind the Statue of Liberty, must never forsake the captive peoples. They must have our thoughts and prayers on January 24—and every day thereafter until they, too, are free.●

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SOLIDARITY WEEK FOR SOVIET JEWRY

HON. ANTHONY C. BEILENSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1982

● Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have brought the plight of Zina and Arkady Abranzon to my colleagues' attention on several occasions as part of vigils held on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives. Unfortunately, this imprisoned couple's situation remains critical; so now, during Solidarity Week—February 20 through February 27—I would again like to speak on their behalf.

On October 5, 1979, the Soviet police broke into Mr. and Mrs. Abranzon's apartment, confiscated all of their possessions, and incarcerated them at Ivano-Frankovsk Prison in the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, where they were held without trial for more than 1 year. The Abranzons are Soviet Jewish citizens who had planned to apply for exit visas before this unfortunate incident.

In November 1980, Soviet officials found the Abranzons guilty of the crime of "possession of resources." Arkady Abranzon was sentenced to 14 years in prison, while his wife, Zina, was condemned to a prison term of 6 years. Disturbingly, no one—including the Abranzons' relatives—has received any word from them in over 1½ years, and we are all extremely concerned about their welfare and whereabouts.

I would like to take the occasion of Solidarity Week to reaffirm my strong belief that releasing the Abranzons and granting them exit visas would not only indicate to the world the Soviet Union's compliance with the Helsinki Accords, but would also affirm its desire to ameliorate relations between our two great nations. I look forward to the day when pleas such as this will no longer be necessary to insure freedom for Soviet Jews.●

A DECLARATION OF FREEDOM

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1982

● Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, distinguished colleagues of the House of Representatives, let me bring to your attention today the fervent contents of the Cuban Declaration of Freedom, first read in Key West, Fla., land of grieving exile for those thousands upon thousands of heartbroken Cuban refugees who immortalized their suffering and their fervent hopes for freedom in this patriotic document of

February 22, 1982

January 23, 1966, when the cruel and mismanaged tyranny of Fidel Castro was still young in Cuba, the homeland of their families.

Some years ago, when I first introduced a bill to commend this moving and important document embodying the painful desires of an honorable people to be free and democratic in the public conduct of their affairs, I expressed my hope that Congress would respond and adopt this proposal of the highest principles. Today, at a time of continued provocation and challenge by the dictator, Castro, I wish to renew my call for support for this worthy and deep expression of the soul of a free Cuba as it was, when it was called the pearl of the Caribbean.

Let us refuse to further stand for the continued impoverishment and oppression of our neighbors to the south in the Caribbean, where individual freedom and dignity are politically trampled by a personal cult of the evil dictator, Fidel Castro. I invite all Members of this House to join with me in this and the following:

H.J. RES. 137: JOINT RESOLUTION COMMENDING THE CUBAN "DECLARATION OF FREEDOM"

Whereas on January 23, 1966, a "Declaration of Freedom" was adopted by one thousand five hundred Cubans in exile meeting in Key West, Florida; and

Whereas this declaration was written in the San Carlos Club from which the great Cuban patriot, Jose Marti, in 1898, turned the course of history by proclaiming the ideological basis of a free Cuba; and

Whereas Cuba once again has fallen victim to a totalitarian regime as embodied by Castro communism; and

Whereas the "Declaration of Freedom" reads as follows:

"In the city of Key West, Monroe County, State of Florida, United States of America, we, the Cuban exiles in the United States, in the name of God Almighty, and speaking both for ourselves and the oppressed people in Cuba, the martyr island, do say:

"That on January 1, 1959, the slavery yoke that came from Europe and was extinguished in Cuba at the end of the nineteenth century, was resumed.

"That those responsible for this high treason to our fatherland and to our people are just a score of traitors who, usurping the government of the country have been acting as mercenary agents for the Sino-Soviet imperialism, and have surrendered to that imperialism our freedom and our dignity, also betraying the American hemisphere.

"That as a consequence of this high treason, those who are usurping the power in Cuba (as they were never elected by the people), are imposing a regime of bloodshed, terror and hate without any respect or consideration to the dignity of the human being of the most elementary human rights.

"That in their hunger for power, these traitors, following the pattern of totalitarian regimes are trying, within Cuba, to separate the family, which is the cornerstone of actual society, and at the same time, are poisoning the minds of the Cuban children and youth, in their hope of extending the length of time for this abominable system.

"That the rule of the law has been wiped out in Cuba, and it has been replaced by the evil will of this score of traitors, who are acting under orders from their masters, the Sino-Soviet imperialists.

"In view of the foregoing, we declare:

"First. That the actual Cuban regime is guilty of high treason to our fatherland and to the ideals of the freedom revolution which was started on October 10, 1868.

"Second. That this score of traitors who have committed treason against our fatherland, in case they survive the downfall of their regime, will have to respond, even with their lives before the ordinary courts of justice of Cuba.

"Third. That as the noble Cuban people will not ever surrender, because that nation was not born to be slave, we, the Cuban people, hereby make the present declaration of freedom.

"We hereby swear before God Almighty to fight constantly, until death comes to us, to free Cuba from communism.

"The fundamentals of this resolution for freedom are:

"First. God Almighty, above all things, in whom we believe as the essence of life.

"Second. The fatherland, with all of its laws, traditions, customs, and history as a spiritual value, only surpassed by the concept of God.

"Third. The family, as the cornerstone of the human society.

"Fourth. Human rights, for each and every citizen, regardless of race or creed.

"Fifth. The law, as the foundation for the proper development of the human society.

"Sixth. Democratic government, with its three independent branches: Legislative, executive, and judicial.

"Seventh. Representative democracy, through the exercise of universal suffrage, periodically, free, and secretive, as the expression of popular sovereignty.

"Eighth. Freedom of worship, freedom of teaching, freedom of the press and free enterprise.

"Ninth. Private property and ownership, as the basic expression of liberty.

"Tenth. The improvement of living conditions for both rural and city working masses, with the just and necessary measures, keeping in mind the legitimate interests of both labor and capital.

"Eleventh. The derogation and eradication of anything which is opposed to the political and religious fundamentals aforementioned, and specifically, the abolition of communism and any other form of totalitarian manifestation.

"Signed and sealed in Key West, Fla., on the 23d day of January, 1966."

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that this inspiring declaration should be patriotically considered by all Cubans in exile and by all who wish to end the tyranny of Castroism and communism in Cuba and that the "Declaration of Freedom" should serve to unite those pledged to restoring Cuban liberty and independence, and that it should be the objective of the United States to commend and encourage recognition and respect for the declaration.●

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. SHIRLEY CHISHOLM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1982

● Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marked a day of commemoration for people of Lithuanian origin.

Sixty-five years ago, the people of Lithuania began living once again under their own flag, free of foreign domination. Although the subsequent years of national independence were few, the spirit and aspirations of Lithuanians remain fixed on the goal of lasting freedom and self-determination for their homeland.

I honor and respect that spirit and those aspirations. They are watchwords of our Nation. Unfortunately, they are concepts which have no real meaning for the leaders of the Soviet Union who have maintained a cruel and illegal occupation of Lithuania.

With hope, with strength, with wisdom and with patience, the people of Lithuania will, I believe, someday regain their cherished national sovereignty. I look forward to joining in their new independence-day celebrations when their struggle for freedom is finally won.●

MSHA ACTIVITIES DECLINE—MINER DEATHS SURGE

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1982

● Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, miner deaths rose by more than 70 percent in the first 2 months of 1982 compared to the same period last year, and now there are disturbing reports heard from the coal fields of an official eye-winking attitude toward safety violations.

Government safety and health regulation of mines is a body of proved procedure that grew painfully over the years in a tragic pattern—disaster, legislation, improvement.

This pattern—though painful—allowed the Mine Safety and Health Administration to reduce coal miner deaths to nearly a 10-year low in 1980.

But in 1981, the management of MSHA changed and the unreasoning fever for budget cuts sliced into an effective agency.

Penalties fell 27 percent, violation notices were down 16 percent and temporary mine closings for safety reasons declined 9 percent.

Fatalities, however, were up 15 percent for the year. And in January and February of this year they were up 73 percent over the first 2 months of 1981.

New management meant new attitudes at MSHA, and the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Mine Safety and Health, Ford B. Ford, is administratively installing a more cooperative approach that is meant to balance safety and health concerns with production.

Meanwhile, there are those in the Congress who would ignore the painfully established success of MSHA to write those considerations into the law.

The Congress would be well advised to remember that the public outcry—disaster by disaster—is the reason the law is the way it is, and that the law has reduced disasters and deaths.

The Subcommittee on Health and Safety, which I chair, Tuesday will inquire into MSHA and recent developments in the coal fields, and the results will be made known.

But, in the meantime, I offer those members who are concerned the following report on conditions in the coal fields from the February 15, 1982, Washington Post to highlight a serious and unnecessary decline in miner safety and the accompanying rise in deaths:

BUDGET CUTS HIT SAFETY ENFORCEMENT LIKE A TON OF KENTUCKY COAL

(By Ward Sinclair)

CRAYNOR, KY.—It makes a somber postcard, black from the rain of coal dust and white from the recent snow, and you know it had to be a terrible explosion.

It started where they were mining, about 800 feet under the mountain, igniting the volatile dust into an infernal force that rushed to the surface like a projectile from the barrel of a cannon.

All seven miners, including three Hamilton brothers who ran the operation, were killed in the Jan. 20 eruption at the RPH Coal Co. Bodies were burned and twisted beyond recognition. The conveyor belt was a tangle of metal. Trees and land outside the mine turned black from the dust spray.

This disaster and a rash of other mine accidents that killed at least 33 Appalachian miners in December and January have touched off a flurry of state and federal investigations of the kind that traditionally follow mining tragedies.

But there is a difference this time.

The federal inspection force, built up gradually after major disasters in 1968, 1970 and 1976, is reeling from Reagan administration budget cuts and policy changes. Critics draw a direct link between these changes and more deaths and accidents, fewer inspections and violation notices in the last year.

President Reagan's proposed 1983 budget was to have cut \$7 million more from mine safety enforcement. But in an unusual move, the White House last week amended the figures upward before the ink on the budget was dry.

Even that, however, won't return mine safety spending to its pre-Reagan levels and, in keeping with its promise to cut the tangle of government rules, the administration is pursuing a regulatory reorganization that skeptics view with alarm.

But to some inspectors in the heart of the nation's coalfield, the contemplated reorga-

nization would simply formalize a policy that is already understood.

"We've lost direction. The morale of the inspector is destroyed," said Hugh Smith, a federal mine inspector based at nearby Pikeville. "It has never been put in writing that we shouldn't enforce the law, but our people know there's a change in attitude in Washington. You only have to watch the 6 o'clock news to know this."

A three-month strike by the United Mine Workers notwithstanding, there were 153 fatalities in 1981, compared with 133 the year before. Through Thursday, there have been 26 fatalities in 1982, compared with 15 during the same period last year.

The Department of Labor's Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA) last year assessed 27 percent fewer civil penalties; its inspectors issued 16 percent fewer violation notices and 9 percent fewer mine-closure orders in fiscal 1981 than a year earlier.

The case of the RFH mine here in Floyd County puts still another light on the picture. Evidence gathered by federal investigators suggests that blatant safety violations were occurring at RFH when it blew up. But on paper, if official inspection reports are to be believed, the RFH mine was a paragon of safety.

During four inspections in 1981, MSHA inspectors gave RFH a clean bill. The mandatory inspections produced only one safety violation notice. Similar spotless records are turning up at other small mines. "The number of violation-free mines last year would shock you," said one official. MSHA is conducting an internal study to determine why historically dangerous mines are suddenly showing up clean.

Although Reagan altered his 1983 budget to lift the freeze on hiring coal mine inspectors, the administration is proceeding on other fronts with policies that appear to have had a severe effect on MSHA morale, both here and in Washington.

Some examples:

MSHA chief Ford B. Ford, aiming for a new era of "cooperation" with mine operators, has shifted more power and duties to MSHA's district managers. Among these will be a procedure, scheduled to take effect in April, that will allow operators to meet privately with the managers to discuss the validity of violation notices issued against them.

Since last fall, MSHA has applied rigid new civil service performance standards to its inspectors, who complain that the result is work schedules that force more cursory, speed-up inspections and fewer surprise spot inspections in the mines.

The hiring freeze has sharply cut the size of the inspection force. For example, the Pikeville district of MSHA, covering a major coalfield, is 44 inspectors below its 1978 level. In MSHA's Prestonsburg office, with clerical help laid off by budget cuts, key supervisors have been relegated to handling paperwork. Nationally, the agency has about 850 inspectors on duty, less than half the 2,000 that an internal MSHA study says are needed to provide full coverage of the mines.

The administration has not taken a formal position, but congressional sources expect it will line up in support of a package of amendments drafted by the American Mining Congress and introduced by Sen. Orrin G. Hatch (R-Utah) to substantially water down the tough 1977 mine safety law.

Fearing layoffs or loss of jobs, many younger inspectors, almost all miners before

joining federal service, are said to be nervous about penalizing mine operators. Their attitude is very poor. Their morale is plain gone. They may be looking for a job next week from the same guy they're inspecting. They're just not spending the time in the mines that they used to and we're getting more complaints about safety from our men at the local mine sites."

In an opinion issued last month, affirming a \$200,000 penalty settlement against the owners of the Scotia Coal Co. mine in Kentucky where explosions killed 26 men in 1976, a federal administrative law judge lashed out at the mine-safety budget cuts from another angle.

Joseph B. Kennedy, a judge with the independent Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, wrote that budget cuts have seriously impaired the morale of inspectors and judges. "In the face of the rising rate of institutional manslaughter," Kennedy said, "the calls for further deregulation and relaxation of the enforcement effort seem unreal, if not morally irresponsible."

Some MSHA career officials in Washington acknowledge the validity of these allegations. Said one: "When our people hear what the president says about overregulation, about bureaucrats and so on, it affects their morale. With the budget cuts, many get furlough notices around Christmas and this has been a big psychological factor."

Inspected or not, the mines continue to run at a merry pace in this part of the mountains. The pressure for production is intense. Loaded coal trucks constantly lumber along the roads. The signs of coal prosperity are everywhere: new homes sprouting on hillsides, new retail outlets, a Prestonsburg store that advertises designer apparel.

One thing does not change.

Coal operators, historically resistant to government oversight, continue to assail MSHA inspections as an example of the overregulation the Reagan administration has promised to abate. In the wake of a grim December and January, some in the industry are calling on regulators to punish miners, rather than operators, for safety infractions.

That line emerged again last week in Hazard, where an investigative commission appointed by Gov. John Y. Brown met to hear miners and mine operators testify on a type of explosive technique common in use here, but banned as too dangerous in most states.

The Hamilton brothers were using this technique, called shooting from the solid, when their RFH mine exploded. At another mine not far from here, the Adkins Coal Co. at Topmost, eight miners died in a similar explosion in December.

After those disasters, the state tightened its rules for this type of blasting. The industry, however, argues that Kentucky, the country's leading coal producer, is inviting economic suicide if the rules are tightened more. Operators at the Hazard hearing claimed that the cost of mechanized equipment to cut out the coal, rather than blast it out, would bankrupt most small operators.

The UMW's Boyd, a member of the governor's commission, couldn't resist when one witness, cutting-machine manufacturer Thomas Pruitt of Grundy, Va., testified that mechanization would vastly reduce explosives costs and save the companies money in the long run.

"What's the difference between the price of a Mercedes and one of your machines?" Boyd asked with a touch of wryness.

"Not a heckuva lot," Pruitt answered. ■

DIAMOND JUBILEE OF PORT JERVIS, N.Y.

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1982

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, this year the city of Port Jervis, N.Y., will be celebrating the 75th anniversary of its charter as a city.

This community, known as the "Gem of the Delaware River," has always been blessed with an ideal and beautiful location at the big bend in the Delaware River—the point where the river ceases its southeasterly flow from the Catskills to the ocean, and suddenly careens to the Southwest. This point is known as "Tristates," where the States of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania meet. It is at this point also that the Neversink River empties into the Delaware. Just a few feet from the mouth of the Neversink is a stone monument marking the junction of the three State boundaries. At this spot, it is possible to stand within all three States at once.

Near the tristate boundary marker is the grave of one of America's most notable novelists, Port Jervis native Stephen Crane, who, in "The Red Badge of Courage" and other novels and short stories written at the turn of the century, vividly portrayed the horrors of war and man's inhumanity to man.

Port Jervis is the site of the Battle of Minisink, fought in 1778. This was the last major battle in New York State between the Indians and the white settlers. The power of the Indians, who had been harassing settlers with the encouragement and support of the British, was broken forever in our region at the Battle of Minisink.

Port Jervis' natural location on the Delaware River, surrounded by the Shawangunk and Pocono Mountains with their gorgeous lakes and trout streams, also benefited from manmade resources. The city was the southern terminus of the Delaware and Hudson Canal, one of the engineering miracles of the 1820's, carved out and designed by John Bloomfield Jervis, from whence the community got its name.

Port Jervis grew by leaps and bounds after its founding in 1829 as a canal town, but did not experience explosive growth until after it became a railroad center in the years just prior to the Civil War. The wonderful old railroad station in downtown Port Jervis has recently been placed on the National Register of Historic Places, and will be a museum of the days gone by when railroads captured the commerce and the hearts of Americans.

As Port Jervis grew, it was incorporated as a village in 1853, and then as a city in 1907.

And now, as it celebrates its diamond jubilee, I invite the attention of my colleagues to the city of Port Jervis and ask my colleagues to join with me in saluting this outstanding community. ●

HANDICAPPED AMERICANS

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1982

● Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, bright Americans are kept from earning the type of living they are capable of, simply because they may not have the use of some of their body.

But now, hope exists for the handicapped. New uses for the computer allow people with a physical handicap to use their minds to become productive, fulfilled citizens.

Johns Hopkins University sponsored a contest to find the best ways to use computers to help the handicapped. I would like to share an article with my colleagues on this contest.

Please take a look at the following article:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 29, 1981]

COMPUTER WIZARDS OPEN NEW WORLD TO HANDICAPPED

(By Diane Granat)

For 49 of her 50 years, Lois, a cerebral palsy victim, could not speak a word, write a sentence or communicate a thought in any way other than flopping her head to signal "yes" or "no."

Then Howard Batie, a modern-day "miracle worker," came into her life.

Batie, a self-described "pentagon paper pusher" dabbles in computers as a hobby. So last year, when asked if he could design a system that would allow Lois to communicate via a computer screen, he was immediately intrigued.

The result is the Handi-Writer, a gadget available for less than \$1,000 that allows Lois to display words and phrases on a screen by pressing five large buttons connected to a basic Radio Shack computer. The screen can display up to 72 words and an alphabet, and the buttons allow Lois to select the letters and words she needs to form a message.

"This has really opened up a world for her," said Batie, a bespectacled naval officer who dreamed up the invention in the basement of his Herndon home.

Batie's invention is one of more than 900 computer-based devices entered in a contest sponsored by the Applied Physics Laboratory at Johns Hopkins University to help the handicapped through the use of personal computers.

This weekend, Batie and 29 other finalists, several from this area, will display their creations at the National Academy of Sciences in Washington. A grand prize winner (who will receive \$10,000) and runners-up will be announced Monday.

Paul L. Hazan, director of the Johns Hopkins project, said the entries used "an amaz-

ing range" of ideas to help the blind, deaf, mentally retarded, learning disabled, physically handicapped and persons with neurological and muscular problems.

The contest, launched by the Laurel, Md., laboratory last November, was "pretty ambitious," Hazan admits. "We wanted to focus the power of this new low-cost computer technology on the needs of the handicapped. And we wanted to harness creativity on a national scale, not just from professionals in the field but from the general public too."

Like Batie's computer system, which was custom-made for Lois but could be used by many speechless, physically disabled persons, most of the inventions tried to solve practical problems of the handicapped, Hazan said.

For instance, Reuel Launey, an Arlington physicist, developed a voice-controlled computer that a quadriplegic can use to operate home appliances, a telephone, a typewriter and other office equipment.

Launey's machine, which says "Good morning, human," turns on lights and tells him the time when he wakes up, was made-to-order for David Ward, a suburban Baltimore man paralyzed from the shoulders down.

Ward, who lost the use of his arms and legs after a fall four years ago, sells industrial equipment and was unable to turn the pages in catalogs and price lists after his accident. Launey said he plans to hook up his computer to a microfiche version of the catalogs, so Ward can use his voice to call up the information he needs to conduct his business.

Many of the inventions are new twists on old ideas. Talking computers have been around for a few years, but Deane Blazie, an electrical engineer from Forest Hill, Md., designed a terminal that reads back everything written on the screen, giving the blind easy access to a computer.

Total Talk, which sells for \$6,000, has been purchased by a blind judge who uses it for legal research and a history professor who is writing a book with his machine, Blazie said. Mainly, though, it is used by blind computer programmers like Ted Henter, who works for Blazie and used to rely on Braille printouts to verify what he types.

"It's so fast, it's like reading the information yourself," said Henter, who can understand the computer's robot-like voice at 300 words a minute, about twice the speed of normal speech.

Other examples of computer wizardry on display this weekend include:

An infrared eye tracking system that allows a nonvocal, severely physically handicapped child to audibly express words or phrases simply by glancing at them on a personal computer screen. An infrared camera associates the position of the child's eyes with a specific word and then the machine says the word in a little girl's voice.

A computer that teaches deaf children to lip read by drawing lips, a mouth and tongue on a screen, and moving them to pronounce a word.

A computer the size of a pocket calculator that a deaf person can use in a phone booth to dial home and convey a message to his personal computer at home.

After the contest ends, Hazan said, Johns Hopkins will sponsor a workshop so the inventors can meet businessmen who might want to manufacture their devices and educators who could use them.

"The bottom line," he said, "is getting these programs in the hands of the handicapped." ●

A SKEPTIC CONVINCED: MINIMUM TILLAGE FARMING SAVES TOPSOIL

HON. BERKLEY BEDELL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1982

● Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, we have taken great strides toward solving the serious problem of topsoil loss on America's farmlands. However, unless we act responsibly, we still face a future whose landscape may include drastically reduced farm production because of soil erosion.

I speak with a sense of urgency when I ask Congress and farmers across the Nation to recognize the need for agricultural practices that utilize conservation techniques. According to the Council for Agricultural Science and Technology (CAST), we are losing approximately 4 billion tons of topsoil per year. This may eventually raise costs and reduce yields for our farmers, thus decreasing the quantity of vital food supplies available to the Nation and for export.

We possess today the know-how to decrease topsoil loss by up to 75 percent, according to CAST, without losing land productivity or profit. I am speaking of minimum-tillage farming and no-till ridge planting, as explained in the book by Ernest E. Behn, "More Profit With Less Tillage." One of my constituents from Iowa, Glenn Tjossem, wrote me exclaiming his success with this exciting new technique.

Glenn writes:

Concerning till planting on the ridge, like the doubter in a recent article, I also thought, it might work on your farm, but our low gumbo fields would be different, but now find I was wrong. After a few years of using till planting on the ridge, our sons who are now taking over the farming ask, why didn't you do this 10 years ago? My only reply is, I didn't think it would work in our gumbo type soil. We're never too old to learn.

He explains:

In our operation we save at least 8,000 gallons of diesel fuel, and about 72 man days on a 12 gallon per hour tractor per year. We have traded off our large 4 wheel drive tractors, as the power requirement of this method is less than one-half of conventional method. These are a few of the benefits of till planting on the ridge but the main reason is that there is no visible loss of soil or water in our rotation of corn and soybeans, the soybean being the big problem with erosion, especially on the loose soil type we have here.

Glenn continues:

About half of the land we farm is contoured, and the slopes there are terraced. We think we now have terraces we do not

need. In Behn's book he mentions, if the slope isn't over 3 or 4 percent no terraces are needed, as this system puts a small terrace every 30 inches. With more rolling land, this system would work well in conjunction with terraces.

I was excited by the comments in Glenn's letter, especially since they come from a self-professed doubter. His examples of fuel and time savings, the need for less powerful machinery, fewer terraces—on top of conserving soil and water, should certainly persuade the rest of us.

Congress plays a central role in influencing the Nation's farm production. Present policies often encourage excessive erosion for short-term, maximum production, and this results in soil deterioration. I urge Congress to redirect its emphasis on agricultural policy toward soil conservation. Farmers should be encouraged to adopt this method of farming to assure a future of productive land use in America. ●

TRANSNATIONAL DATA FLOWS

HON. DOUGLAS K. BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1982

● Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw my colleagues' attention to an article which appeared in the February 1982, issue of the ABA Banking Journal. That article highlights an important but frequently overlooked aspect of our international trade problem; restrictions on international data flows. As the Reagan administration and the Congress turns its attention increasingly upon barriers to international trade, I hope that this element of the problem is not ignored.

Excerpts of the article, written by Washington attorney Robert Plesser, follow:

ISSUE OF DATA FLOW ACROSS NATIONAL BORDERS MUST BE FACED

(By Ronald L. Plesser)

Banks with international operations are having to make fundamental policy choices as the result of the concerns being raised in connection with the movement of banking information from one country to another. . . .

Now, with dramatic increases in the speed and volume of data flow through computers, and with other communication advances, individual nations and international organizations are beginning to examine national policies to identify what transborder problems exist, if any. They are considering whether there should be controls on the flow of data, or no restrictions at all. . . .

Importance now. This issue has been looked at for several years by many U.S. businesses in general, and particularly by the banking industry, as an issue yet to develop fully. . . .

The concerns are getting more and more real as countries enact policies that restrict how a multi-national company or a multi-

national service industry like banking may be able to do business in the future.

If each country has differing approaches as to how information and data services are treated for tax, customs, and liability purposes, then it may become more difficult (costly) to transact business internationally.

Further, information itself may be considered having value, and, as a result, the question is being raised whether it should be taxed, trade-restricted, or otherwise treated as a commodity.

There may be several long-range responses to these issues but one thing is certain: Transborder data flow is a developing issue that should be dealt with affirmatively by the private sector and the U.S. Government. . . .

Tension. The U.S. response to date has been to discourage international barriers to trade while at the same time seeking to develop a response to the great advances brought about by an exploding information environment. This has created some tension in the official U.S. policy response to this issue. The government is trying to show that no restrictions are warranted, while at the same time we have adequate customs, practices, and laws in the area of personal privacy.

U.S. policy on transborder data flow is being coordinated by the State Department with the active technical assistance of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA), the Department of Treasury, the Office of Special Trade Representation, and others. Congress has expressed some interest (H.R. 1957) in creating a commission that would have more explicit authority to coordinate U.S. Government policies for these issues. That coordination, however, continues to be managed by the Department of State, with budget cutbacks severely limiting the important role that NTIA and others are able to play.

Canadian example. As an example of the concerns particularly facing banks, consider recent Canadian banking legislation. The Canadian Bank Act, adopted November 19, 1980, requires that all data generated in Canada by banks must be processed in Canada unless the specific approval of the Canadian Bank Inspector is obtained. Further, when a bank intends to process, outside of Canada, information or data generated by banks in Canada, the bank must so inform the Banking Inspector. The Inspector "may direct the bank to further process information or data relating to . . . [such information] in Canada and the bank shall forthwith comply with any such decision." [Section 157(4)(5) and (6) of the Canadian Banks and Banking Revision Act, 1980].

The Canadian Act was enacted to allow foreign banks to operate in Canada while providing for regulatory controls by the Canadians. The Canadians do not contend that their statute is a restrictive trade act, nor do they claim it is a privacy protection. The implications, however, are straightforward: A U.S. bank which is centrally managed in the United States must create duplicate facilities in Canada and the U.S. if it is to do business in Canada and maintain centralized U.S. processing facilities. It may also be prohibited from sending data to the United States for even duplicative processing.

The question is whether the enactment of this law is an isolated event or part of a growing trend which will require banks to examine data-flow issues in every country in which they intend to operate.

Lending impact. Although modern banking today is a collection of different finan-

cial services, the key function is still the lending of money. To do this with a minimum amount of exposure, banks need to be able to gather information about the various aspects of loan portfolios on a worldwide basis. Banks need to know before making a financial decision the total exposure of a bank to a particular customer, or to a particular group, or to a particular country, or in a particular currency, or to a particular industry. All this information is necessary to enable a bank to conduct prudently the normal lending business of international banking.

Banks also engage in short-term financing to assist the movement of goods throughout the world. For this purpose, they need to have quick access to all types of information about the political and economic bases of the various trading areas of the world.

In short, to enable banks to carry on the business of international banking successfully and prudently, banks need to be guaranteed the free flow of information and access to that information throughout the world on a timely basis. The concern, then, is whether the trend towards some regulation of the flow of information may inhibit banks from fulfilling their information needs.

Bit of history. These issues and the U.S. response to them have been developing since the early 1970s. Sweden enacted a data protection law in the very early 1970s creating a data commission with the authority to license and approve all automated data systems.

The United States, focusing on the privacy interests of individuals, enacted a series of acts which create legitimate interests of confidentiality in personal records.

A wider base of European countries (France, Germany, the Netherlands, and Denmark) then enacted their own data-protection acts, which followed the more centralized approach of the Swedish government. These data-protection acts created a new basis for concern because they stated that data on natural persons may not flow out of their countries unless they are transmitted to countries with levels of data protection "equivalent" to their own.

With a growing concern for "Balkanization" in data flows, the Council of Europe and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) have responded to these issues. The Council of Europe enacted a treaty, now undergoing ratification by its European members, which creates some uniformity of treatment among its members for data protection. The broader-based OECD also has taken a very central role in this issue. It first issued guidelines on privacy and now is studying non-privacy issues involved in transborder data flow, through an expert group.

Shifting concerns. The concerns are now shifting to non-privacy issues. These issues include taxes, custom duties, intellectual property, liability, extra-territorial application of national laws, choice-of-law issues, and the need for the free flow of information.

The OECD is undertaking a survey of national laws and practices to determine if countries treat these issues differently and whether there is the need for international uniformity to assure the "free flow of information."

A concern is raised as to whether there is a need to consider developing more guidelines without any idea of what the conflicts between the laws of various countries are. Moreover, guidelines may mean more re-

strictive legislation prior to an effective demonstration of real problems.

Transborder data flow is an issue which will continue to challenge the private sector as well as government decision-makers. It also is an issue which is not likely to disappear. The implications of it should be examined for the future and judgments should be made as how best to respond to them.●

URGENT NEED FOR INCREASED SUPPORT OF NATIONAL EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS REDUCTION ACT

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1982

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I am increasingly concerned about the future viability of the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) role as lead agency for coordinating the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977. Emphasis seems to be shifting within FEMA to a much greater role in military-related civil defense. This possible shift in emphasis at FEMA is coming at a time when there are reports of a greater than 50-percent chance that a catastrophic earthquake is expected in California in the next 30 years. Estimates of fatalities range from about 3,000 to more than 13,000. Property losses are expected to be higher than in any past earthquake in the United States, with estimates of between \$15 billion and \$60 billion.

I want to stress that California is only one of many States where an earthquake may occur. Perhaps the most violent quakes on record in the United States occurred at New Madrid, Mo., in 1811 and 1812. Another event of large magnitude took place near Charleston, S.C., in 1866. Geologists believe that earthquakes are likely in more than 30 States, although the probability in any one spot is much less than that in the Pacific States.

My view that the earthquake hazards reduction program should be strengthened and supported is maintained in a recent report, "Geodetic Monitoring of Tectonic Deformation—Toward a Strategy." The report by the National Research Council Assembly of Mathematical and Physical Science identified leading hypotheses and problems with regard to measurements of crustal deformation. It established a priority of effort and described in a general way the required instruments and procedures. This report recommended "a substantial expansion in the current program of tri-lateral and other geodetic measurements for crustal movement studies in the Western United States: More frequent measurements, more closely spaced sites, extension of networks to greater distances away from the main

faults and more complete coverage of the major fault systems. The report also stated, "There is a major earthquake threat to California, the State of greatest population and capital investment. Because of this threat, crustal movement studies must be established as a national priority and be vigorously pursued by the scientific community."

In view of the potential damage and loss of life, it seems a wise policy to strengthen and support this program designed to improve predictive capabilities, prepare emergency response plans, and engage in earthquake-related research. Because of the increasing importance of this issue, the Subcommittee on Science, Technology, and Space of the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology of the House Committee on Science and Technology will hold joint hearings on the authorization of the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act on March 11. Witnesses will include State officials experienced in emergency planning, as well as scientists and Federal officials familiar with the national earthquake program.●

COMMENTS ON THE PRESIDENT'S STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1982

● Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues an article I wrote for the San Jose Mercury News following President Reagan's state of the Union address.

[From the San Jose Mercury News, Feb. 3, 1982]

THE STATE OF THE UNION IGNORES THE STATE OF THE ECONOMY

(By NORMAN Y. MINETA)

President Reagan's State of the Union address was disappointing. The president failed to recognize the most pressing issues facing our nation—the deep recession, rising unemployment, large budget deficits and high interest rates.

One year ago, President Reagan sketched out a far-reaching economic program designed to reduce inflation, increase employment and foster economic growth. The president launched this nation on a test of supply-side economics using the economic welfare of our country as the guinea pig. When the president proposed his plan to cut taxes, increase defense spending, reduce social spending and balance the budget, many economists said that it would not work. Even Vice President Bush called it "voodoo economics." Economists predicted huge budget deficits and record high interest rates.

After long, difficult bargaining wars, Congress passed all of the essential elements of the president's economic program. The

president received cuts in federal spending for social programs, large increases for defense spending and a massive cut in corporate and personal income taxes. It is important to note that not only was the funding reduced for most federal programs, but in many cases programs were eliminated entirely. With just one vote, Congress acceded to the president's wishes by adopting a single piece of legislation which made changes in more than 250 existing programs and laws.

People are now beginning to realize the full impact of what has been taking place in these past 12 months. Instead of cutting only the fat—the "fraud, waste and abuse"—from the federal budget, the knife is cutting the arteries that support the economic survival of our nation's poor and working citizens. The administration's economic program strikes at working Americans, at the poor and the elderly in a harsh and cruel way. At the same time, the administration's policies reward the powerful and the super-rich.

A distinguished Republican senator from Oregon, Mark Hatfield, recently described this economic program very accurately by saying that the administration's new federal policy is a "policy of taking and cutting from the truly needy and giving to the truly greedy."

Not only are working Americans suffering under this economic experiment, but the nation's economy is also suffering. During 1981 we saw economic activity decline steadily, and the nation is currently in a severe recession. Long-term interest rates that really count for housing and business investment are now higher than in any month during 1980. These high rates in the face of declining inflation indicate a belief that the president's program will lead to even higher rates for years to come. In addition, short-term rates have started to rise again.

An even more disturbing fact is that there are currently more than 9.5 million people officially included in the unemployment statistics in December. This figure underestimates our unemployment problem because more than 1 million people have been so discouraged by economic realities that they have given up actively seeking work and are therefore not counted in the unemployment figures. In addition, during the first week in January, 1 million people filed initial unemployment claims. Furthermore, all of these figures fail to include the families of the unemployed.

These are the realities we face today. They are neither the promise nor the goal of supply-side economics. The current economic situation is very critical, and unless corrective actions are taken, the nation could be plunged into a depression. We cannot afford to allow this experiment to continue much longer. Even when measured against the goals the president set for himself, the experiment is off course.

Just last July, the president told Congress that if his program was adopted, real GNP would grow by 2.5 percent in 1981 (measured fourth quarter 1980 to fourth quarter 1981). According to the latest figures from the Commerce Department, real GNP grew by only 0.7 percent in 1981. The administration estimated that inflation would fall to 8.6 percent in 1981 and the unemployment rate would peak at 7.7 percent. The inflation rate for 1981 was 9.6 percent. The unemployment rate reached 8.9 percent in December and most economists predict that it will reach 10 percent in the next few months.

The president has also failed to fulfill his promise to slow the growth of federal government spending in his State of the Union address, the president said that the administration's program "calls for a reduction in the rate of increase in government spending, and already that rate has been cut nearly in half." The facts are that the program has merely shifted the growth of spending to military spending and interest payment on the national debt; the program has not cut spending.

Spending this year is growing at 12 percent, slightly higher than its average rate of growth from 1971 through 1981. Furthermore, spending will be 24 percent of GNP this year, an all-time record except for World War II, and up from 23 percent last year. In addition, this year's deficit is projected to be more than 3.5 percent of GNP, up from 2 percent of GNP last year.

The president attempted to defend this ballooning deficit by stating that inflation was brought down faster than expected and as a result has "deprived government of those hidden revenues that occur when inflation pushes people into higher income tax brackets." However, in July, the president estimated that the Consumer Price Index would slow to 8.6 percent in 1981, instead in 1981 the CPI was at 9.6 percent—higher, not lower, than the president expected. Thus the slowdown in inflation cannot be blamed for the largest deficit in the history of our country.

In 1982, the federal deficit will be closer to \$109 billion instead of the president's promised \$42 billion level. In 1983, the deficit could climb to \$155 billion. And in 1984, the deficit could reach \$190 billion, far from the goal of a balanced budget. Overall, it is expected that close to \$455 billion will be added to the deficit in the next three years—more than two and a half times the increase during the four years of World War II.

The national debt will be increased by approximately \$2,000 for every man, woman and child in the nation. Our country has never had to endure deficits of this size. It must not be allowed to do so now. Large deficits force the government to borrow money in the credit markets, which results in increased interest rates and reduces the credit available to the private sector for investment. The administration must understand that you can't decrease revenues with a massive tax cut, increase defense spending by \$69 billion, and reach a balanced budget by 1984. The president fails to acknowledge the results of his economic proposals.

In the State of the Union we did not hear mention of a balanced budget. Instead the president managed to turn the focus away from the current economic crisis by proposing yet another experiment—"new federalism." This time the president has proposed to experiment with the basic framework of government. The "new federalism" is a sweeping proposal to change the current program and funding relations between federal government and states and localities. "New federalism" only changes the structure of government, it does not create one new job, it does not provide incentives for stimulating economic growth, and it does not reduce the ever-growing budget deficits.

The president said that his economic program will "stimulate the economy . . . provide capital for expansion, mortgages for homebuilding and jobs for the unemployed." Since the president came into office, his programs have:

Caused a serious recession—real economic growth fell 5.2 last quarter;

Reduced new investment—capital goods orders fell nearly 12 percent during 1981; Pushed homebuilding to a 35-year low; Increased unemployment by 2 million to 9.5 million;

Increased long-term interest rates by more than 2.5 percent; and Increased business failures by more than 45 percent.

We've heard before that if we "do a little more" we can win the war. Now, we keep hearing how if we endure a little longer, and cut spending a little further, we will prove this economic theory a success.

Wall Street doesn't believe it. I don't believe it.

Someone may be seeing a light at the end of the economic tunnel, but I don't know who that person is. It has been clear to me for some time that the major thrust of this economic program is to reward the rich, while at the same time dismantling every federal program designed to help people prosper and provide the needed infrastructure for economic growth.

This economic experiment must be stopped before more jobs are destroyed, before high interest rates choke off all investment. It is a president's responsibility to ensure that his economic policies meet the needs of the nation. President Reagan has neglected this responsibility. The president cannot ignore the state of the economy by unveiling a governmental reorganization scheme as a diversion.●

THE 64TH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIA'S DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

HON. WILLIAM F. CLINGER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1982

● Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, the rumblings of revolt from Poland remind us that proud peoples cannot be denied basic freedoms forever. Today, as we pause to remember the 64th anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence, we declare our admiration for that nation's courage in facing the denial of its citizens' basic rights by the Soviet Union. As Americans, we pray that their Independence Day may someday be celebrated as joyously as our own.

By signing the Helsinki accords in 1975, the Soviet Union endorsed the right of all people to self-determination. Since then, it has imposed its military might on the people of Afghanistan, backed a brutal crackdown on the people of Poland, and supported numerous guerrilla campaigns that would extend the Moscow empire to Latin America and Africa. Incredibly, the Soviets explain that these actions were taken to insure freedoms rather than to deny them. But the absence of freedom in Lithuania and the other Baltic countries is evidence of the Soviet Union's disrespect for human rights.

Forty-two years after the annexation of Lithuania, the United States refuses to recognize Soviet domination

of that nation, which existed nearly 700 years before Stalin's Russia invaded. To a nation with as long and rich a history as this one, 42 years of domination is not enough to destroy the spirit and hope of its people.

Despite our abhorrence of Russia's continued denial of Lithuania's right to exist, we are soberly aware that our words here today will not reverse the crime committed four decades ago. But let us remember that the passage of time will never erase that crime. The candles that burn in our windows burn not only for Poland, but for all those people whose hope for freedom endures.●

CONGRESSMAN TONY HALL PROVIDES UPDATE ON POSSIBLE FOOD SHORTAGE IN EAST TIMOR

HON. TONY P. HALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1982

● Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, nearly 2 years ago, as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I introduced an amendment to the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1980 concerning the tragic situation in the former Portuguese colony of East Timor, an island territory that was invaded by Indonesia in late 1975. In the months immediately preceding the introduction of my amendment, conditions in East Timor were described in press accounts as comparable to those in Cambodia.

The measure I introduced expressed the sense of Congress that the President should take measures to encourage the Indonesian Government to allow increased access to East Timor for international relief organizations and to permit them to establish relief operations directly in East Timor. It also sought to encourage the Indonesians to allow free emigration from East Timor, particularly in the case of families whose members had already left the territory while others remained behind.

The amendment was adopted unanimously by the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs. It eventually became section 408 of Public Law 96-533. The full text of section 408 follows:

PUBLIC LAW 96-533

EAST TIMOR

Section 408. It is the sense of the Congress that the President should take all appropriate measures to—

(1) continue to support and encourage relief operations by the Government of Indonesia and by international relief agencies in East Timor;

(2) assist the Government of Indonesia to facilitate the reuniting of families separated because of developments in recent years in East Timor; and

(3) encourage the Government of Indonesia to allow access to East Timor by international journalists.

In 1980, international relief agencies were able to eradicate some of the worst effects of the catastrophic situation that they had encountered the year before. However, on December 9, 1980, a report in the New York Times cited an Indonesian Government announcement that no international food aid would be accepted for East Timor beyond the end of that year.

Nevertheless, Members of Congress were assured that the food situation in East Timor was under control. Notwithstanding such assurances, the Times account quoted sources who warned of further tragedy if international relief agencies pulled out of East Timor.

By May 1981, these agencies—which were never allowed more than a token presence in the territory—ended their full-time, on-the-ground activities in East Timor. Further relief efforts henceforth would be under Indonesian, rather than international, auspices.

The international access to East Timor sought by Congress in section 408 clearly has not been secured. As Mr. David Scott, representing the Australian Council for Overseas Aid, Community Aid Abroad (Australia), and the Human Rights Council of Australia, said in a statement presented to the Fourth (Decolonization) Committee of the United Nations on the Question of East Timor on October 21, 1981:

Circumstantial, but no less powerful evidence, of resistance, food shortages and repression is found in the continuing refusal of the Indonesian Government to allow representatives of the United Nations, the International Jurists, Red Cross, foreign missions, international organizations or the media to enter and freely move around the country. This is after the unbelievably long period of 6 years following an occupation which the occupying forces would have us believe was welcomed.

All available evidence appears to confirm that one of the reasons that Indonesia has been denying outside free access to East Timor is that it does not want the world to know about its military initiatives against Timorese resisting Indonesian rule.

January 1982, reports in the Australian media quote statements by Monsignor Martinho da Costa Lopes, the Roman Catholic bishop of East Timor, pointing to Indonesia military operations and forced conscription of Timorese villagers, which have resulted in serious food shortages in the territory. The bishop warns that a renewed famine is a real possibility unless sufficient international food aid reaches East Timor in the coming months.

This news media is most distressing. It follows other accounts of the effects of Indonesia's latest military push, including charges from Roman Catholic Church sources introduced into the RECORD last December 16 by Senator PAUL TSONGAS alleging that pregnant Timorese women and small children were put to death by Indonesian forces.

These horrifying reports should not distract us from another important issue, that of Timorese who wish to leave the island to join their families abroad. Little progress was made on this front in 1981. As the Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 1981 states: "In general, however, movement on the repatriation front has been slow over the past year."

Articles in late 1981 in the Boston Globe and the Christian Science Monitor describe the plight of those seeking to leave East Timor. These articles support the conclusion that Indonesian authorities are preventing people from leaving East Timor. They also suggest that Portugal should be playing a much more active diplomatic role on this question, through available intermediaries, to deal with urgent family reunification cases.

It should be noted that the State Department's human rights report on Indonesia is peppered with references to the situation in East Timor. As the Country Reports summarizes: "Much of the current international interest in human rights in Indonesia is focused on allegations of abuses in East Timor."

My particular concern is the threat of famine looming over East Timor. The Australian Government announced last month that it will ship 1,000 tons of corn in response to the appeal of the Timorese Bishop.

While this is an encouraging development, past food assistance has not prevented new Indonesian military offensives from renewing serious food problems on the island. Particularly alarming is the fact that there are currently no international relief agencies operating in East Timor to oversee the distribution of relief—or to offer some form of protection against violence to the population.

Unfortunately, the Indonesians already have indicated to the Australians that they are unwilling to permit Australian aid agencies to operate directly in East Timor. As the Indonesian Embassy press attaché was quoted as telling the Australians in the Sydney Morning Herald of January 12, 1982:

The procedure is to give relief or aid to Indonesia and especially Timor through the Indonesian Red Cross. To give directly to East Timor will not be allowed.

In view of the attitude of the Indonesians, the administration should act to implement the sense of Congress expressed in section 408 and call upon

the Indonesians to permit independent, international relief agencies to operate on a full-time basis in East Timor. Now is the time to encourage such international presence in East Timor if food shortages are to be averted. This is one of those rare opportunities we have to head off a food crisis, rather than react to it.

In order to bring my colleagues up to date on developments in East Timor, articles by Daniel Southerland, of the Christian Science Monitor, and Arnold S. Koken, an East Timor expert appearing in the Cleveland Plain Dealer, follow:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 11, 1982]

**EAST TIMOR MAY FACE FOOD SHORTAGE
INDONESIAN MILITARY OPERATION COULD BE
CAUSE**

(By Daniel Southerland)

Still recovering from the famine which struck only a few years ago, the small former Portuguese colony of East Timor may now be facing new food shortages.

In January, it was learned that Monsignor Martinho da Costa Lopes, the Roman Catholic bishop of East Timor, sent an urgent appeal to nearby Australia, calling for aid. He said that a major Indonesian military operation on the Southeast Asian island territory had disrupted planting, causing food shortages.

In Australia, Indonesian embassy officials denied there was a critical need for food on Timor, but the Australian government said that it would give 1,000 tons of corn to help avert shortages. Australian aid officials have been requesting direct access to the island territory, which has been largely shut off to the outside world since Indonesia annexed it after invading more than six years ago.

In the United States, Senator Paul Tsongas (D) of Massachusetts has drawn attention to East Timor. Last December, Tsongas referred to early accounts from Timorese Catholic sources reporting possible food shortages and an alleged massacre of Timorese civilians. On Feb. 8, Tsongas cited additional information from Monsignor Lopes. The Senator noted that there are no international relief agencies working on East Timor on a full-time basis and urged that Australia's Catholic Relief organization be permitted to enter the island to supervise the distribution of the newly promised Australian aid.

"To the best of our knowledge, the food situation is not critical," said a U.S. State Department official. The official said that his information was based on reports from diplomats and members of international organizations who visited Timor over the past several months.

As a precautionary measure, however, the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) helped late last year to fill several warehouses in Timor with food.

American interest in East Timor stems from close U.S. ties with Indonesia, the world's fifth most populous nation. The Indonesians used American weapons in their December 1975 invasion.

The United States has contributed heavily to international aid efforts on Timor, providing a good part of the food which was shipped to counter the widespread starvation which followed the Indonesian inva-

sion. In the view of U.S. officials, the Timorese, who have their own distinctive identity and language, never stood a chance of forming a viable separate state. Critics of U.S. policy dispute this assertion.

In its recently issued annual reports on human rights, the U.S. State Department mentions East Timor about a dozen times, and states that much of the current interest in human rights in Indonesia is focused on allegations of abuses in East Timor. These include allegations of killings, disappearances, and large-scale detentions. The Indonesian government denies that abuses have occurred. The State Department says that it is "difficult to independently confirm or deny" the allegations.

What the State Department does say, however, is that the Indonesians restricted access to the island to foreign observers more in 1981 than in 1980. It also says that East Timorese have left the island more slowly during the past year. Indeed, according to the department, only six of the families in an ICRC program and 47 in an Australian program have been allowed to leave Indonesia since Oct. 15, 1980.

One indication that all is not well on East Timor came last year from an unlikely source. Members of the Indonesian-installed East Timor provincial assembly, in a report to Indonesia's President Suharto, warned that members of the Indonesian military were behaving on Timor like "conquerors towards a conquered people." They said the assembly was continually receiving complaints from the Timorese about corruption and mistreatment by the military, including torture. In November, the two assembly members who signed the report were arrested. The State Department says the best available evidence indicates that they were released by the end of last year.

According to the Reuters news agency, the document prepared by the Timorese assemblymen was similar to a secret report compiled recently by Catholic priests in Timor for the Vatican.

Sen. Tsongas said this and other information confirmed his belief that an international presence is needed in East Timor to help protect the civilian population from violence and to distribute food.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Jan. 13, 1982]

PLIGHT OF TIMEY TIMOR (By Arnold S. Kohen)

It should be a news story of major importance: many tens of thousands killed—perhaps a third of the territory's 600,000 inhabitants—as a result of a military invasion by a nation with a population 200 times its size.

The occupation forces continue a ruthless campaign to destroy nationalist resistance while keeping news of the situation from the outside world by allowing few people to leave.

The victim nation fought bravely on the Allied side during World War II, losing at least 40,000 lives while sheltering Australian commandos. But its erstwhile friends turned their diplomatic backs when, in 1975, East Timor, a Southeast Asian island territory then emerging from 400 years of Portuguese colonial rule, faced invasion by its huge neighbor, Indonesia.

The State Department has admitted that "roughly 90%" of the arms available to the Indonesian generals—rulers of a strategically located, oil-rich nation with the world's fifth-largest population—at the time of the 1975 invasion were American-supplied; U.S. weapon shipments were stepped up thereaf-

ter. Jakarta has also received American diplomatic support for its position at the United Nations, which nevertheless has repeatedly rejected Indonesia's claim to sovereignty over East Timor.

And significantly, whenever new reports of Indonesian atrocities have surfaced, U.S. officials have gone to great lengths to shield Jakarta from congressional and press criticism.

Whatever the level of U.S. involvement, it has been far from easy to draw Americans' attention to the situation: Few have ever heard of East Timor, and there are perhaps a dozen Timorese-Americans in the United States—hardly the makings of a pressure group.

Nonetheless, the invasion and the illegal use of U.S.-supplied weapons for aggressive purposes attracted enough attention to stimulate an initiative in early 1976 by Rep. Tom Harkin, D-Iowa, aimed at reducing U.S. military aid to Indonesia. The effort failed, but Congress held four hearings in 1977 and 1978 to probe, in the words of then-Rep. Donald Fraser, D-Minn., "allegations of genocide committed by the Indonesian-armed forces against the population of East Timor."

In September 1978, a group of journalists, among the few allowed a glimpse of the territory since the invasion, cited accounts alleging that hundreds of Timorese were dying of starvation each month. In late 1979, international relief officials were finally admitted to the island, and they reported that conditions were "worse than Biafra and potentially as serious as Cambodia."

At the same time, a group of Timorese refugees, mainly Roman Catholic priests, traveled to the United States in an attempt to alert Congress and the news media to their country's plight.

This was at the height of the Cambodian famine, which followed the Vietnamese invasion of that country. The Soviets were invading Afghanistan. Though they tried, officials in the State Department were unable to explain persuasively just why the Indonesian invasion of East Timor was any different, or less in need of a humanitarian and political solution.

Indonesia's status as a "friendly" nation and its staunch anti-Communist presence in Southeast Asia were factors in the unsympathetic response of "security-minded" people in the press and in Congress. Besides, Timor was an impoverished agrarian area with no wealth, apart from its people, for even Indonesia to exploit. The best reason anyone can offer for the invasion is simply that East Timor was there, the Portuguese were not, and Indonesia saw "instability" in the area.

Still, the congressional hearings in 1979-80 and the brief flurry of media coverage were enough to prod Jakarta into allowing some humanitarian aid onto the island. While that may have prevented some further deaths, it had no effect on other basic problems.

One of the Timorese priests (East Timor is largely Roman Catholic) who testified before Congress reported later that his relatives had been threatened because of his statements here. The Indonesians are still denying permission to emigrate, and those who dare to apply, and families of those who have left, are punished or threatened.

In late 1980, Amnesty International reported arbitrary executions of surrendered nationalist guerrillas by the Indonesian forces, "disappearances" and large-scale imprisonment without trial. Amnesty (and the Catholic Church in East Timor) recom-

mended that international relief agencies be permitted to maintain and expand their presence in the territory to provide some level of protection for the Timorese population.

Last May, the Timorese seemed to have gained a new and important ally in Sen. S.I. Hayakawa, R-Calif., chairman of the foreign relations subcommittee on Asia. He circulated a letter among his colleagues supporting the need for continuing, full-time, on-the-spot international supervision of the situation.

A diverse, bipartisan group of nearly 30 senators supported the letter, illustrating how a relatively small amount of press coverage had spread awareness of the Timor tragedy in Washington. But the initiative fell through when Hayakawa suspended the letter under pressure from the Reagan administration, which shares the Carter administration's reluctance to press Indonesia.

Meanwhile, horrifying accounts continue to arrive from East Timor. The most recent is a report introduced into the Congressional Record last month by Sen. Paul E. Tsongas, D-Mass., of a new Indonesian military offensive in which 500 Timorese, including children and pregnant women, were said to have been massacred. Church sources say that the latest Indonesian "operation" could lead to a renewal of serious food problems—this at a time when Jakarta has barred further international food aid for the island.

A few Timorese still manage to get out. A small group is now in this country, under the auspices of humanitarian organizations, to give firsthand accounts of the tragedy being suffered by their countrymen. Unfortunately, they arrived at a time when America is preoccupied with the suppression of the people of Poland. The people suffering on a little island thousands of miles across the Pacific wish that they could receive even one-tenth the attention.

[Kohen is a free-lance writer who has been working with Timorese refugees in the United States and Europe. This was written for the Los Angeles Times.]

CHANGES IN HUD REGULATIONS

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1982

● Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine, Mr. Warren H. Brockway, has some excellent suggestions for changes that should be made in certain HUD regulations. He is the executive director of the housing authority of the city of Newnan.

Warren is in an excellent position to see where our tax money goes. He has some ideas on how to cut out much of the fraud and abuse that plagues our subsidy programs.

I would like to share with my colleagues a letter I received from Warren:

THE HOUSING AUTHORITY
OF THE CITY OF NEWNAN,
Newnan, Ga., December 17, 1981.
Congressman NEWT GINGRICH,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR NEWT: After filling in your questionnaire, I am pressed to comment on some of the things we administer at the Newnan Housing Authority (411 units) that could be changed to be less costly to taxpayers except that we are expected to and do follow HUD rules.

1. Utility Allowances. By bedroom size of apartments (number of bedrooms) we allow or deduct from rent of each tenant for gas, electricity, water and sewerage an amount that totals \$243,000.00 annually. There is no way to encourage the majority of tenants to turn down the thermostats. If it gets too hot, they open the doors and windows. If a portion of the \$243,000.00 could be saved it would directly lessen the subsidy we ask for paid by the Government or in other words, you and I pay.

Solution: Don't cut back our subsidy without making it possible for us to establish rules that will reduce the \$243,000.00. If you cut the \$243,000.00 to \$150,000.00 and force the tenants to pay the balance themselves, it would probably hurt some elderly but maybe the others would be able to survive with the thermostat at 65 to 68 degrees. There is no easy answer but it can be done with flexible local rules that we don't presently have.

2. Contract rent. Presently around 100 of 411 pay no rent at all. Bad, yes, but consider that we are also forced to pay their utility bills. These 100 are not elderly. They are tenants that don't or won't work. (Rent is based on income with deductions for dependents). Suppose every tenant had to pay a minimum of \$50.00 per month rent. This translates to \$60,000.00 rental income or \$60,000.00 less in subsidy plus an additional saving if they pay utility costs.

3. Welfare is counted as income. Sure, there is need for Welfare but as you said, make the able bodied earn their way. Not with CETA programs but pass it down to local levels by:

- a. Making them get a job in industry;
- b. Pay them for working for City or County administered jobs;
- c. Work for individuals doing domestic, yard work, etc. with the individual employers paying \$2.00 per hour and subsidize \$1.50 per hour. This would require some real honest administering.

4. Food Stamps. We don't administer at the Housing Authority either Welfare or food stamps but we are in a position to observe the results. Cheating to the extent of fraud is rampant and very little is done to police same. It seems that children whose mothers ask for Welfare and food stamps have a father somewhere (that's a brilliant statement), but he gives no support. I don't understand why we (the government) don't press for the admitted fathers of these children to contribute to their support. In many cases we feel sure that the fathers are:

- a. On a visitor basis one or more nights per week with bedroom privileges with the child's mother;
- b. Buying gifts for the child;
- c. Passing money and/or food to the family (under the table);
- d. Permitting their admitted child to use their mother's maiden name instead of his name;
- e. Yet upon admission or upon reexam the mother freely admits who the father is and

gives his name. This practice gives the father his whole paycheck and his freedom.

5. Additional Comments. You are aware that if a single person (man or woman) no matter how poor cannot get into low rent housing. Yet, get pregnant, have a child and we must take her application.

Congress has tried to help PHAs by saying that we do not have to rent to those who have a minimum income if we have more than 20 percent low income that are "credit renters," but that is only a deterrent to a few because the smart ones apply and have a job, get qualified, get an apartment, move in and two weeks later quit their job, report that they have no income. We can't move them out and they become credit renters. Don't think for a minute that this doesn't happen.

No, Newt, I'm not a Scrooge and I want to help the poor with all my heart, but we must do something to trap the doubledippers and it can be done.

First no Congress, no group can write rules that would cover the problem without hurting some that should not be hurt. Therein lies the problem. Quit trying. Relax the rules that presently protect those who are doubledippers so that the burden can be transferred.

Yours truly,

WARREN H. BROCKWAY,
Executive Director.●

TRIBUTE TO DR. ANTHONY PEROTTI

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1982

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to note an important event in my district. Dr. Anthony Perotti, after many years of service to the Audubon School District and the South Jersey educational system, retired at the end of January.

Most recently, Dr. Perotti served as administrator of corrective programs at Audubon High School. Previously, he had been administrative principal of Audubon Park Elementary School. Dr. Perotti is certified as a school administrator, school supervisor, secondary principal, elementary principal, and secondary teacher of English and social studies.

A graduate of Rutgers University and Rutgers Law School, Dr. Perotti is the treasurer of the Law School Alumni Association. His community activities include the Knights of Columbus, Holy Name Society, C.Y.O., and several basketball and baseball youth leagues. Dr. Perotti was also active in many education societies: NJEA, NEA, N.J. Association of School Administrators, and the PTA.

I am proud to represent citizens such as Dr. Perotti, whose outstanding service in the field of education makes him a valued member of the community. His years of community service are an achievement which certainly warrants high recognition.●

SECRETARY WATT THREATENS LOCAL PARKS

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1982

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Committee on Interior Affairs held several days of hearings recently on threats to the natural and cultural resources of the National Park System.

Some of the most severe threats are due to the policies of Secretary James Watt who is considering opening wilderness areas, national parks, and frontier areas of the coast to oil and gas development.

An additional threat exists—that to State and regional parks, a portion of whose land may have been donated by the Federal Government. Because the Federal Government retained subsurface mineral rights, some in the Interior Department have concluded they should consider opening these State and regional parks to oil and gas drilling.

Mr. Speaker, these are local parks supported by local taxpayers in the expectation that these lands would remain recreational areas. It would be an unjustified affront to these citizens and a total contradiction of the Reagan administration's professed respect for local decisionmaking, to have Secretary Watt begin selling off oil leases in local parks while his Department fails to enforce statutory mandates that oil companies explore and produce from their existing leases diligently.

I would like to share my testimony on this extremely serious situation with Members of the House.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN GEORGE MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I would like to thank you for allowing me to participate in these timely hearings on "Threats to the Natural and Cultural Resources of the National Park System."

Surely one of the most tragic policies of the Reagan administration has been its utter callousness in the management of our natural resources. While overlooking conservation and alternative power sources, the Reagan administration appears intent upon offering up our national parks and wilderness areas on the altar of "energy independence." That is a short-sighted and totally unnecessary policy, and it represents a retreat from eighty years of bipartisan support for conservation and preservation of our national resources.

I would like to alert the subcommittee to a facet of the administration's policies which lies slightly beyond the immediate scope of today's hearing. I refer to the announced policy of the Interior Department to consider the leasing of subsurface federal mineral rights which underlie state or regional

parks and recreation areas. A situation of this type has recently appeared in my district, and may reoccur throughout the nation. It deserves your attention because such leasing proposals would undermine local determinations about land use and park policy, and betray the trust of the people of Contra Costa County. Application of this inconsistent policy could severely impair local planning and land management throughout this country.

In 1975, the Federal Government transferred 360 acres of surplus land near Antioch, California, to the east bay regional park district, retaining subsurface mineral rights although all leases on the property had already expired. There is no record of any oil or gas reserves in the area, and, in fact, an exploratory drilling effort two years ago on the periphery of the preserve failed to find any traces of oil or gas.

Just a few weeks ago, an additional 180 acres of land were added to this park, known as the Black Diamond Mines Regional Preserve, through purchases and donations by the Southport Land and Commercial Company.

The Federal Government's agreement to assist local residents in the preservation of this site for public use was established by the land transfer six years ago. Federal interest in assuring public access to the land was reaffirmed by the Interior Department and Congress only last year when we approved expenditures in excess of \$318,000 to close old mine openings which jeopardize public safety and restrict full utilization of the park land.

Late last year, however, the area manager of the Federal Bureau of Land Management informed officials of the park district of the possible leasing of subsurface mineral rights within the Black Diamond Preserve. Both park officials and I have expressed our very strong displeasure with such a proposition, which seems related to this administration's curious conclusion that the only way to achieve energy self-sufficiency is by throwing open our parks and wilderness areas to the oil companies.

When State or local jurisdictions are ceded lands by the United States for park land purposes, it seems reasonable that they be given assurances that those lands will not be defiled through mineral exploration except under very extraordinary circumstances. The mere fact that oil or gas may exist should not lead the Interior Department to discard the history of these lands and move in the oil derricks. This policy was recently stated by B.L.M. in the Federal Register of December 21, 1981, when, in commenting on possible oil and gas leasing in the national parks, the Department concluded, "The existence of a resource should not guarantee the right to extract the material without balancing the adverse effects of the activity . . . [those] activities should not inflict a significant adverse effect on the administration of the recreation area [or] . . . impair the scenic, scientific and historic features contributing to public enjoyment of the area." (page 62040)

Mr. Chairman, if oil and gas leasing should not impair the administration of Federal parks, we certainly should not override the legitimate objections of State or local administrators, especially when they are seeking to protect lands given by the Federal Government in the first place. To override those concerns makes a mockery of the administration's pledge to grant greater authority over local decision-making to the States. It also makes it nearly impossible to

responsibly manage these lands or plan for their long-term use.

I also believe that the mere consideration of such oil and gas exploration in park land is an inappropriate and unnecessary response to our energy needs.

The administration would do far better to improve its monitoring of production and royalty payment on lands already given over to mineral production than to sanction the invasion of recreational lands. The fact is that over 90% of the onshore lands already leased for oil and gas production are not being developed, and a substantial percentage of the offshore lands are not being explored.

The Interior Department persists in the leasing of both worthless and highly lucrative lands onshore through means of a ludicrous lottery system which disposes of billions of dollars of public resources in a glorified church raffle. Offshore, Secretary Watt has decided to rapidly expand leasing on the Outer Continental Shelf even though we lack the technology and materials to explore much of the frontier area targeted for upcoming leases.

Little wonder, as a result, that the General Accounting Office recently condemned the Interior Department's proposal to expand massively the OCS leasing program, noting that Secretary Watt lacks the administrative capability to oversee such a leasing program. The failure of that monitoring was made apparent in the recently released report of the Commission on Fiscal Accountability for the Nation's Resources which concluded that inadequate royalty collections cost the American taxpayers \$650 million in 1981.

Mr. Chairman, these issues are closely related to those being addressed in these hearings. If the administration is intent on expanding domestic energy production, let them focus on those lands set aside specifically for that purpose. Let them diligently monitor the production of resources from those leases before gobbling up lands which prior administrations, congresses, and the states have set aside for other public purposes. To this point in history, there is no evidence that accelerated leasing means increased oil and gas development. But it can result in the permanent loss of valuable and irreplaceable parks and wilderness areas which would be needlessly sacrificed.

Again, I appreciate having the opportunity to direct your attention today to the impacts of federal leasing decisions on state, as well as federal, park lands. ●

A BILL TO CREATE AN OCEAN AND COASTAL RESOURCES FUND BASED ON OCS REVENUES

HON. WALTER B. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1982

● Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today my colleague from New Hampshire (Mr. D'AMOURS) and I introduced H.R. 5543, a bill to establish the ocean and coastal resources management and development fund. This legislation would establish a framework for basing State ocean and coastal resource management block grants

on an extremely modest proportion of Federal revenues from the development of Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) oil and gas resources. It will serve the twin purposes of preserving valuable ocean resources funding and providing an incentive for coastal States to cooperate with greater OCS oil and gas development.

H.R. 5543 is similar to, and based on the same premises as, title IV of H.R. 4597, a bill that I introduced on September 25, 1981. Because of a growing consensus that ocean and coastal resource block grants based on a proportion of OCS revenues is an idea that should proceed independently of other OCS-related amendments, we have separated this concept and introduced it as a separate bill, H.R. 5543.

The proposed legislation contains modifications to title IV of the original bill—modifications that have resulted from hearings held by our Subcommittee on Oceanography, chaired by the gentleman from New Hampshire. These modifications were designed with several objectives in mind: To retain the nationally competitive character of the sea-grant college program; to bring added dimensions of equity and incentives for the disbursement of block grants to the coastal States, and to provide such States with a greater degree of flexibility in the application of the grants.

Proceeds from the fund would be applied to further the purposes of the national sea-grant college program and to provide block grants to coastal States. These grants would permit continuation and enhancement of State programs for coastal zone management and the coastal energy impact program. Additionally, they would provide States with the opportunity and commitment to accept an increased responsibility for the management of ocean fisheries and living marine resources, necessary to offset a dramatically reduced Federal presence. H.R. 5543 is a clear manifestation of the administration's new federalism and emphasis on block grants.

The benefits of offshore oil and gas development are spread nationally while the impacts are disproportionately felt in the adjacent coastal States and localities. The fund established by our bill would provide coastal States with fiscal resources adequate to prepare for and address the impacts that inevitably accompany mineral extraction activities close to their coastal areas. Currently, this capacity for preparedness is being threatened with extinction as a direct result of the administration's proposed termination of important ocean and coastal management programs. The Nation's policy of accelerating OCS development is one of which I am strongly supportive. However, this policy should not be accompanied by

the elimination of programs that foster wise management of our ocean margins. By failing to recognize the Federal-State partnership required for accelerated OCS development, these inconsistent policies threaten to inhibit the OCS leasing process by promoting conflict and litigation.

It is imperative that our country proceed, in a timely and responsible manner, with the development of OCS resources. This requires a modest investment in the maintenance and improvement of the ocean and coastal management capabilities of affected States. Our legislation would require a very small proportion of funds, based on OCS revenues received by the Federal Government, to be allocated to the States for this maintenance and improvement and to accelerate significantly our offshore program.

The fund would be based on only the increment in Federal OCS revenues that result from the acceleration of our offshore program. Specifically, fiscal year 1982 would be the base year from which only 10 percent of the growth in revenues after that year would form the basis for the fund—but with a ceiling of \$300 million. To put this in a somewhat different perspective, it should be pointed out that the administration has estimated that \$18 billion will be deposited in the Treasury from OCS revenues in fiscal year 1983. The \$300 million established by the fund in our legislation would be the equivalent of 1.67 percent of such revenues—an extraordinarily modest investment for the protection of our State coastal management and fishery programs and for the expansion of our offshore oil and gas program.

We would also ask our colleagues to review the proposal in the context of the question of equity between interior States and coastal States with respect to the sharing of Federal revenues. Under the Mineral Lands Leasing Act of 1920, as amended, 50 percent of the Federal mineral leasing receipts are paid directly to the States within which mining occurs. In many other cases, an additional 40 percent is returned indirectly through a reclamation fund. Equally important, interior States have been granted the authority to place a tax upon the severance of mineral resources from Federal lands. In 1978, Montana collected as much as \$25 million from the severance of coal mined under Federal leases. Other minerals mined under Federal leases are also subject to State severance taxes. Finally, State and local governments also receive compensation for property taxes lost as a result of Federal ownership of lands.

On the other hand, coastal States receive no direct share of OCS revenues and are not authorized to tax or generate revenues from Federal leases on the Outer Continental Shelf. H.R.

5543 would go a long way toward correcting this inequity and would require considerably less, in terms of money and proportion, than that provided under the Mineral Lands Leasing Act.

Our bill provides a timely solution to the problem of maintaining the capabilities of State and local governments to participate in offshore leasing decisions. It will accommodate accelerated development of OCS mineral resources by reducing user conflicts and litigation. Furthermore, by providing funds in block grant form, this bill will substantially reduce the Federal administrative role and increase State decisionmaking flexibility. The bill is complementary to the policies of the administration and we urge bipartisan support of this critical legislation when it reaches the floor of the House. ●

LOUISVILLE: A GREAT PLACE TO LIVE

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1982

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative for the Third District of Kentucky which encompasses the city of Louisville, I call your attention to the following statistic which appeared in the Courier Journal on January 29, 1982:

In a national survey recently released, the Louisville community was ranked 19th out of 277 cities listed as the best community in which to live.

As Louisvillians, we are proud of our great city, and are proud that others are finally recognizing what the citizens of Louisville have known all along. ●

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF H.R. 5494

HON. GARY A. LEE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1982

● Mr. LEE. Mr. Speaker, the following is the conclusion of my section-by-section analysis of H.R. 5494, the proposed Ancient Indian Land Claim Settlement Act of 1982.

SECTION 4. RATIFICATION OF PRIOR TRANSFERS AND EXTINGUISHMENT OF RELATED CLAIMS

Subsection 4(a) provides that all transfers of land or natural resources located in New York and South Carolina made by or on behalf of any Indian tribe prior to January 1, 1912, shall be deemed to have been made in accordance with the Constitution and all laws of the United States, and that such Congressional approval, validation, and ratification shall be effective as of the date of

the transfer. By ratifying an ancient Indian land transfer effective as of the date of the transfer, it is the intent of Congress to remove the cloud of Indian claims against all current and former landowners in these three states who may trace their titles back to the transfer being approved. Taken together with subsections 4(b) and 4(c), this subsection is intended to eliminate completely and effectively all Indian tribal land claims and related claims for monetary compensation that may exist as a consequence of the pre-1912 transfers.

The January 1, 1912, cut-off date has been selected because it would embrace all known ancient Nonintercourse Act-type claims against current landowners in these states, while leaving unimpaired any claims regarding land disputes of a comparatively recent origin.

The approach and language in section 4(a) and in the balance of section 4 are essentially identical to the approach and language utilized by Congress in the comparable provisions contained in the Maine Indian Claims Settlement Act of 1980, Pub. L. No. 96-420, 94 Stat. 1785, and in the Rhode Island Indian Claims Settlement Act, Pub. L. No. 95-395, 92 Stat. 813 (1978).

Congressional approval, validation or ratification of earlier transfers of Indian lands has been judicially upheld even when such approval has come many years after the transfers in question. For example, in considering the impact of a statute enacted by Congress in 1927 on the validity of an 1858 acquisition by the State of New York of lands held by the Seneca Nation, the Court of Claims concluded:

"[I]f federal consent was needed under the Trade and Intercourse Act, such approval has been given. All agree that appellant would have no complaint if assent had been given at the time of the appropriations. But approval can also come afterwards, and that is what happened here. In 1927, Congress provided that New York's game and fish laws should thereafter apply to the Senecas' Oil Spring Reservation (among others), except 'that this Act shall be inapplicable to lands formerly in the Oil Spring Reservation and heretofore acquired by the State of New York by condemnation proceedings.' [Citation omitted.] This explicit recognition and implicit ratification of New York's ownership of the tract must be taken as Congress' approval of the original appropriation, as well as of the state's continued claim of right."

"(Seneca Nation of Indians v. United States, 173 Ct.Cl. 912, 915 (1965) (emphasis added).)"

Subsection 4(b) makes clear that to the extent any transfer approved under subsection 4(a) may involve any aboriginal title held or claimed by an Indian tribe, subsection (a) shall be regarded as a Congressional extinguishment of such aboriginal title as of the date of the transfer. Congress' broad power to extinguish Indian aboriginal title was articulated by Justice Douglas in *United States v. Santa Fe Pac. R.R. Co.*, 314 U.S. 339, 347 (1941):

"The power of Congress in that regard is supreme. The manner, method, and time of such extinguishment raise political not justifiable issues. [Citation omitted.] As stated by Chief Justice Marshall in *Johnson v. McIntosh*, the exclusive right of the United States to extinguish Indian title has never been doubted. And whether it be done by treaty, by the sword, by purchase, by the exercise of complete dominion adverse to the right of occupancy, or otherwise, its

justness is not open to inquiry in the courts."

Subsection 4(c) makes explicit two effects that the provisions of subsections 4(a) and 4(b) are intended to have. The provision is included in the Act in order to avoid any possible ambiguity that otherwise might arise in the absence of such explicit language.

First, subsection 4(c) provides that by virtue of the approval, validation and ratification of Indian land transfers provided by subsection 4(a) and the extinguishment of aboriginal title provided by subsection 4(b), both of which are effective as of the dates of the original Indian transfers, no action by the United States, any state of subdivision thereof, or any other person or entity after the transfer shall be regarded as giving rise to a claim for trespass damages or any other type of claim for monetary recovery based on the subsequent use or occupancy of the land by non-Indians.

Second, subsection 4(c) makes clear that to the extent any actual or theoretical claims for trespass damages, for mesne profits or for use and occupancy may have arisen subsequent to the transfer, all such claims shall be regarded as extinguished as of the date of the transfer.

Subsection 4(d) is designed to preserve the agreement made by the Seneca Nation and its lessees with respect to certain leases made by the Seneca Nation in the latter part of the nineteenth century pursuant to the Act of February 19, 1875, 18 Stat. 330, as amended. In these leases, the Seneca Nation leased certain of its lands for a period of 99 years, after which possession of the lands is to revert to the Senecas. Absent this subsection, the bill may have the effect of extinguishing the tribe's underlying interest in these lands, thereby making its lessees the owners of the leased lands. Such a result would be contrary to the intentions of the parties when the leases were made. Accordingly, this subsection ensures that the terms of these particular leases will be unaffected by the bill.

SECTION 5. NOTIFICATION OF CLAIMS TO THE SECRETARY; SETTLEMENT AGREEMENTS

Section 5 provides for one of two alternative means by which Indian tribes affected by section 4 of the Act may obtain a monetary award from the United States for the settlement of their claims.

Subsection 5(a)(1) specifies that as soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register a notice specifying that any Indian tribe whose transfer of land or natural resources has been approved, validated and ratified by section 4 may submit to the Secretary such information as the tribe may wish the Secretary to consider in making the determinations specified in subsection (c)(1).

Subsection 5(a)(2) specifies that to the extent the Secretary already possesses information about a particular Indian tribe needed to make the determinations specified in subsection (c)(1), the Secretary shall consult with representatives of said tribe in order to minimize the burden on the tribe in preparing the submission specified in subsection 5(b).

Subsection 5(b) provides that any Indian tribe affected by section 4 of this Act may, no later than 180 days after the Secretary publishes his notice in the Federal Register, submit to the Secretary information in response to the Secretary's notice.

Subsection 5(c)(1) provides that within 180 days after the date by which submis-

sions are made pursuant to subsection 5(b) (or within approximately one year after publication of the Secretary's Federal Register notice), the Secretary shall determine, with respect to each Indian tribe that has made a submission pursuant to subsection 5(b), whether such Indian tribe had a credible claim, and, if so, the fair and equitable monetary award that the Secretary believes should be paid by the United States to that tribe. The provision makes clear that these determinations are not to be subject to judicial review.

Subsection 5(c)(2) specifies several factors that the Secretary may take into account in determining the fair and equitable monetary award to be made to an Indian tribe.

Subsection 5(d) provides that a tribe has 60 days from the date of the Secretary's determination under section 5(c) within which to accept or reject the Secretary's determination. Upon acceptance by the tribe, the determination of the Secretary shall become final and binding on all parties.

Subsection 5(e) authorizes the Secretary to assist any Indian tribe that will be receiving monetary compensation under section 5 to use all or a portion of such funds to purchase land or natural resources from any person or governmental entity that is willing to sell such land or natural resources. This subsection does not authorize or permit any condemnation of land or natural resources by the Secretary; rather the Secretary is authorized to use his good office to assist the Indian tribe in negotiating for the acquisition of land from those persons or governmental entities that may be willing to sell land to the tribe. The subsection also provides that the Secretary, after consultation with the appropriate state and local governments, may assist the tribe in acquiring federal lands that otherwise may be available. The amount of any monetary award provided to a tribe under section 5 shall be reduced by the fair market value of any such federal lands acquired by that tribe.

Any land acquired pursuant to subsection 5(e) shall be acquired by the tribe in fee simple title rather than held by the United States in trust for the benefit of the tribe. Also, any land acquired shall be subject for all purposes to the civil and criminal laws and jurisdiction of the state in which the land is located in the same manner and degree as land owned by non-Indians. Consequently, lands acquired by Indian tribes pursuant to this subsection will be subject to state and local real property taxes and assessments and thus will not deprive state and local jurisdictions of their existing tax base.

Subsection 5(f) is intended to provide the Secretary with authority to adopt such procedures or to utilize such other personnel as necessary to assist him in carrying out his functions. In addition, the subsection provides that interested parties, such as the states involved in the claims, may be permitted to present information relevant to the Secretary's determinations.

SECTION 6. RECOVERY AGAINST THE UNITED STATES IN THE COURT OF CLAIMS

Section 6 provides an alternative means whereby Indian tribes whose land transfers are approved, validated and ratified by section 4 of the Act may obtain compensation from the United States. The ability of a tribe to bring an action under section 6 is not dependent on that tribe's having made a submission to the Secretary under section 5, although a tribe cannot obtain a double recovery under the provisions of both section

5 and section 6, and, if a tribe chooses to make a submission to the Secretary under section 5, it may not file or proceed with its action under section 6 until the Secretary has made his determination under section 5(c).

Subsection 6(a) provides that any Indian tribe that occupied or possessed land or natural resources in the States of New York, or South Carolina and that has never obtained a final judgment from the Indian Claims Commission or Court of Claims with respect to the transfer of such land or natural resources may bring an action in the Court of Claims against the United States within one year of the date of the enactment of the Act, or for those tribes that desire to pursue the opportunity for settlement of their claims afforded by section 5, within the 180-day period beginning on the date of the Secretary's determination under section 5(c) of the Act. Indian tribes, such as those tribes in the State of New York, that previously have obtained final judgments from the Indian Claims Commission or Court of Claims on claims relating to their eighteenth and nineteenth century transfers of land in New York would not be entitled to relitigate those claims under section 6.

On the other hand, several tribes in these three states never pursued a claim against the United States before the Indian Claims Commission and would be entitled to seek recovery from the United States under section 6 even though the time limit for filing claims against the United States under the Indian Claims Commission Act (July 26, 1951) has long since passed. Why certain tribes in these states pursued a recovery against the United States under the Indian Claims Commission Act while others did not is not presently known. The most likely explanation is that until the courts began to address the meaning and scope of the Nonintercourse Act in the last two decades, the tribes that did not bring claims before the Indian Claims Commission did not believe that they had claims under the Nonintercourse Act for which they could obtain compensation from the United States before the Indian Claims Commission.

The proviso to subsection 6(a) makes clear that the Court of Claims shall make no award under section 6 to any Indian tribe regarding any claim with respect to which a settlement agreement has been agreed to pursuant to the provisions of section 5.

Subsection 6(b) sets forth the factual determinations that must be made by the Court of Claims with regard to any filed claim in order to grant the recovery provided by subsection 6(c). With respect to those claims that are predicated upon a transfer of land or natural resources by an Indian tribe that took place after the enactment of the Nonintercourse Act (July 22, 1790), the Indian tribal claimant must establish that (1) it is an Indian tribe (the standards to be utilized by the Court of Claims in making this determination would be those that have been developed by the courts in cases such as *Montoya v. United States*, 180 U.S. 261 (1901)), (2) at the time of the transfer that is the subject of the claim, the claimant or its predecessor in interest was an Indian tribe, (3) at the time of the transfer the claimant had a possessory or ownership interest (i.e., aboriginal or recognized title) in the land or natural resources, and (4) the claimant or its predecessor in interest did not receive fair consideration for the transfer. If the transfer took place prior to the enactment of the Nonintercourse Act (i.e., prior to July 22, 1790) the claimant must, in

addition, establish that under applicable law at the time of the transfer (e.g., the Articles of Confederation), the transfer was invalid unless approved or consented to by the United States and that such approval or consent was never obtained.

With regard to transfers that took place after July 22, 1790, the proviso to subsection 6(b) specifies that no recovery shall be awarded if the United States establishes that the Nonintercourse Act provision of the Trade and Intercourse Act of 1790 was not applicable to such transfer or that the requirements of that Act had been complied with prior to the enactment of this Act.

Subsection 6(c)(1) provides that any claimant that is entitled to a recovery against the United States by having established its claim in accordance with the provisions of subsection 6(b) shall be awarded monetary damages equivalent to the difference between the fair market value that the claimant should have received for the transfer of its interest in the land or natural resources and the compensation, if any, actually received by the claimant or its predecessor in interest (whether such compensation was received at the time of the transfer or subsequently). This standard of compensation is essentially identical to that utilized by the Indian Claims Commission in determining awards made to Indian tribes whose land had been transferred to or taken by the United States for less than fair or conscionable consideration or to Indian tribes whose claims were based on transfers to third parties where the United States had a fiduciary duty to present transfers at less than fair or conscionable consideration. By providing this standard of compensation, Congress would be ensuring that, with respect to any Indian land transfer that is approved by the Act, the Indian tribe will have obtained fair consideration.

Subsections 6(c)(2) (i) and (ii) provide that for any award granted by the Court of Claims under section 6 involving a transfer that took place after the enactment of the Nonintercourse Act, the amount of the award shall be increased by simple interest from and after the date of the transfer until the date final judgment is entered in the Court of Claims. Under subsection 6(c)(2)(i), if the transfer involved land held under aboriginal title, the amount of interest shall be two percent per annum; under subsection 6(c)(2)(ii), if the transfer involved recognized title, the amount of interest shall be five percent per annum.

Subsection 6(c)(3) provides that any final award granted by the Court of Claims shall be paid to the Indian tribal claimant in three equal annual installments.

Subsection 6(d)(1) directs the Court of Claims, to the extent practicable, to give precedence on its docket to claims filed under this Act. The purpose of this provision is to ensure that claims under the Act are heard and adjudicated by the Court of Claims as expeditiously as possible.

Subsection 6(d)(2) provides that review of Court of Claims judgments under section 6 of the Act may be obtained by petition for a writ of certiorari in the Supreme Court in the same manner as such review may be sought for other Court of Claims judgments.

SECTION 7. AUTHORIZATION

Section 7 provides the necessary authorization for the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to meet the obligations of the United States in any settlement agreement agreed upon under section 5 or to pay

any final judgment of the Court of Claims under section 6.

SECTION 8. INSEPARABILITY

Section 8 provides that if any provision of section 4 of the Act (the provision validating the ancient Indian transfers of land or natural resources and extinguishing all claims relating to such lands or natural resources) or of subsections 6(c) (1) and (2) of the Act (the provisions specifying the amount of any award that may be granted by the Court of Claims) is held invalid with respect to a particular Indian tribe, it is the intent of Congress that the entire Act be invalidated with respect to that tribe. The purpose of this provision is to ensure that (1) no Indian tribe may obtain recovery from the United States under sections 5 and 6 of the Act with respect to a particular transfer of land unless section 4 is effective in eliminating all possible claims that such tribe may otherwise have for the recovery of such land for related damages, and (2) the liability of the United States to such Indian tribe under section 6 is limited in accordance with the provisions in subsections 6(c) (1) and (2).

The second sentence of section 8 provides that if any other section or provision of the Act is held invalid, it is the intent of Congress that the remaining sections or provisions of the Act shall remain in full force and effect.

SECTION 9. LIMITATION OF ACTIONS

Subsection 9(a) provides that any action to contest the constitutionality or validity of the Act must be filed within 180 days of the date of enactment. The purpose of this provision is to ensure that, after the expiration of a reasonable period of time, the United States, the states and local governments affected, current landowners and all other persons who have or acquire rights in the lands covered by the legislation can know with certainty and finality that such lands will not be subject to future challenges by Indian tribes. A similar provision was contained in the Rhode Island Indian Claims Settlement Act. In the past, Congress has enacted provisions requiring that challenges to the constitutionality of legislation be instituted within periods as short as sixty days of the date of enactment. See, for example, section 203(d) of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline Authorization Act (Public Law No. 93-153) (43 U.S.C. § 1652(d) (1976)) and the memorandum prepared by the American Law Division of the Library of Congress discussing the constitutionality of such a provision (reprinted at 119 Cong. Rec. 24317 (1973)).

Subsection 9(a) also requires that any action to contest the constitutionality or validity of the Act shall be brought in the federal district court for the district in which the land or natural resources that are the subject of the Indian claim are located.

Subsection 9(b) provides that except for claims filed with the Court of Claims under section 6 or actions brought under subsection 9(a) to challenge the validity or constitutionality of the Act, no court of the United States, including the Court of Claims, and no court of any state, territory or possession of the United States, or of the District of Columbia shall have jurisdiction over any action or proceeding by or on behalf of an Indian tribe with respect to (1) the invalidity of any transfer of land or natural resources that has been approved, validated and ratified by section 4, (2) any claims, such as claims for trespass damages, mesne profits, or use and occupancy, arising from the alleged invalidity of any such

transfer, or (3) any claims against the United States for compensation as a result of the Act. While the provisions of section 4 are intended to prohibit all possible Indian claims relating to the transfers of land or natural resources embraced within that section, the purpose of subsection 9(b) is to make clear that the courts shall not take jurisdiction over any claims based on the alleged invalidity of the transfers covered by section 4 or of any claims for additional compensation from the United States beyond the compensation authorized by section 6. The provision is patterned on the comparable provisions of section 2(d) of the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947 (29 U.S.C. § 252(d) (1976)).

NATIONAL PARK PROTECTION ACT OF 1982

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1982

● Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Public Lands and National Parks recently completed 4 days of hearings on the state of the national park system. The committee had reviewed the 1980 "State of the Parks" report prepared by the National Park Service which provided valuable information on the threats to the cultural and natural resources within the parks. Subsequent reviews revealed that very little was being done to remedy these documented problems.

The witnesses at our hearings—75 in all, including scientists and other experts, representatives of national and local organizations familiar with parks throughout the country, and National Park Service officials—not only confirmed the alarming deterioration of park resources but also elaborated upon numerous new threats documented subsequent to the 1980 report.

Indeed, the National Park Service's 1980 report listed 4,345 identified threats to resources within the national park system. Over 50 percent of the reported threats were from sources outside the parks—air and water pollution, acid rain, massive developments near park boundaries, and resource utilization adjacent to or even within the parks. Threats to park resources originating within the parks included human overuse, theft of plants and archaeological and paleontological resources, excessive noise and poaching of game animals. Leasing of public lands next to parks for oil and gas drilling and mining activity is also increasing. The Department of the Interior recently issued guidelines for such leasing within the boundaries of five national recreation areas. Twelve of our most prized national parks, honored by selection as International Biosphere Reserves by UNESCO, each averaged over 36 known threats that

were degrading the very resources these parks were established to protect.

The need for increased staffing and funding for the National Park Service to combat the loss of park resources was a paramount theme of both public and administration witnesses. However, we learned that both funding and personnel for these programs have been reduced by the Department of the Interior, while funding for upgrading recreation facilities—which will probably increase visitation and threats at some park units—are recommended for increases.

The Director of the National Park Service testified that these restraints have limited the actions he can take to protect park resources. He noted that he has very limited statutory or regulatory authority to respond to many of the documented problems.

Mr. Speaker, the concept of the national park system—beginning with the establishment of Yellowstone over a century ago—was a completely American idea and invention, a special and unique ethic in land preservation, rooted in the American frontier. It has been the model for national parks all over the world. Today, our national park system contains the best representative samples of our great natural and cultural resources. It is a legacy that we must hold in trust for future generations. Yet, unless we act now, much of it could be destroyed.

I am therefore today introducing a bill that would provide protection for the national park system by greatly strengthening the hand of the National Park Service in dealing with present and future threats to these priceless natural and cultural resources. Specifically, the National Parks Protection Act of 1982 would do the following:

First, provide authority for, and direct the use of, National Park Service funds to monitor, study, and report on impacts on the natural and cultural resources of the parks;

Second, authorize the National Park Service and the Department of the Interior to control activities on Federal lands adjacent to the parks, so as to guard against degradation of park resources;

Third, require that Federal grants, licenses, and permits include conditions necessary to protect the parks against adverse impacts;

Fourth, provide for assistance to local governments to promote planning for areas adjacent to the parks that will emphasize park protection; and

Fifth, require the Park Service to prepare a biennial report to Congress on the state of the national parks.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this legislation so that we can protect our great national park system before it is too late.●

ROBERT R. NATHAN

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1982

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, over the Christmas holidays I caught up on some reading, including a paper prepared for the Institute for Study of Regulation and the American University by one of the most thoughtful economic leaders on the American scene, Robert R. Nathan.

Not only is he one of the economists which Time magazine and others have relied upon, he is one of those to whom I have looked through the years for both a sense of direction and commonsense.

In his statement on November 1 he has a paragraph on indexation that I believe merits careful consideration by those who put together this Nation's economic policies.

In his statement Nathan says:

Indexation of pensions and other payments do need careful evaluations. Since part of the rise in consumer prices in recent years has been attributable to OPEC actions, it ought to be clear to everyone that 100-percent indexation is not feasible. There is no possible way in which standards of living of retired government workers or social security beneficiaries or employees can be indexed at 100 percent without causing further inflation and shifts in income between those who receive 100-percent indexation and those who do not. We need to develop new indexes for escalation purposes which would exclude price rises attributable to OPEC and which would be geared to the expenditure patterns of those who are the beneficiaries of such escalation clauses. Another alternative would be to set some reasonable proportion of the Consumer Price Index as a ceiling, such as legislating that no income should be indexed at more than three-quarters of the percentage change in the Consumer Price Index. This is a complicated and difficult area, but nonetheless important in the fight against inflation.

That is not pleasant reading, but something along this line needs to be looked at as part of the overall, long-range solution for our economic problems.

Bob Nathan has served this Nation with distinction in a variety of ways, and he has done it once again by speaking candidly about one of our problems.●

LAW OF THE SEA RESOLUTION

HON. CLAUDINE SCHNEIDER

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1982

● Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, the Third United Nations Conference on Law of the Sea will convene its 11th session on March 8, 1982, in New

York City. Unfortunately, many of the 159 participants are unclear about the extent of further U.S. involvement in attempting to agree on a final, comprehensive Law of the Sea Treaty. Therefore, I am today introducing a concurrent resolution reaffirming congressional support for the Conference and urging the U.S. delegation, while seeking appropriate changes in the draft text, to endeavor to join in an early, successful conclusion of a comprehensive Law of the Sea Treaty. I am pleased that 28 of our colleagues, including nearly half the congressional advisers, are joining me in sponsoring this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has exercised leadership over more than a decade in the formulation of a comprehensive body of international law governing the peaceful uses of the seas. The current draft treaty encompasses navigation and overflight rights, scientific research and development, fishing, the ocean environment, and the recovery of mineral and energy resources. With the participation of more than 150 countries, the LOS negotiations certainly represent the most comprehensive advance in international maritime law to date.

The United States has a great stake in the successful completion of an international Law of the Sea Treaty, including: Maintenance of the United States influence in other international forums; alleviation of critical dependence on foreign governments for vital, strategic minerals found in abundance on the ocean floor—we import 89 percent of our cobalt and 71 percent of our nickel, among others—by eliminating the confusing regulatory environment facing our Nation; uniform delineation of military navigation and overflight rules, clearly in the national interest; realistic, uniform rules for commercial navigation, which will eliminate subjection of shippers to conflicting jurisdictions claimed by coastal nations; resolution of international boundaries and fishing rights; and comprehensive treatment of the problem of marine pollution.

The oceans beyond the limits of national jurisdiction are generally considered the "common heritage of mankind." The dual approach of the Conference, to establish uniform rules for use of the oceans and to insure participation in their peaceful uses by landlocked and less-developed countries, fulfills this concept. Naturally, each member State will strive to maximize its interests in the pursuit of these overall objectives.

Early last year, the administration undertook a review of the draft treaty and U.S. participation in the Conference, the review resulted in identification of several areas of concern, particularly with regard to seabed mining and the operating entity with which to

carry it out. On January 29, the administration announced its decision to attend the 11th session of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS III). Certainly it is important that the U.S. delegation strive for a treaty in our country's best interest. However, the culmination of a reasonable document representing a clear consistent body of international law and principles is in our longrange national security and economic interest. Further, our participation in any comprehensive international accord is vital to its successful operation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all our colleagues to join in reaffirming our support for the Law of the Sea Conference. The text of this vitally important legislation follows:

H. CON. RES. —

Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress concerning the ongoing negotiations with respect to a comprehensive law of the sea treaty

Whereas for more than ten years the United States has taken a leadership role in promoting a comprehensive treaty on the law of the sea;

Whereas the United States supported the resolution adopted by the United Nations in 1970 which endorsed, inter alia, the principle that the seabed and ocean floor and subsoil thereof beyond the limits of national jurisdiction are the common heritage of mankind;

Whereas the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, representing more than 150 countries, has been formulating a comprehensive draft treaty since 1974;

Whereas the provisions of the current draft treaty of the third United Nations Conference make vital and valuable revisions in and additions to the existing body of international law concerning the law of the sea, including provisions governing fishing, marine scientific research, protection of the marine environment, and exploitation of offshore energy resources;

Whereas provisions of the draft treaty relating to military navigation and over-flight are vital to the national security interests of the United States;

Whereas the draft treaty establishes a regime of uniform national boundaries that is vital to the efficient transportation of energy resources and other goods in international commerce;

Whereas the establishment of such a regime of uniform national boundaries would limit the steady seaward expansion by certain countries of their national boundaries;

Whereas the seabed contains an abundant supply of hard minerals such as nickel, copper, manganese and cobalt, and it is in the national interest of the United States for these minerals to be available independently of the export policies of foreign countries;

Whereas United States participation in a comprehensive treaty on the law of the sea is essential to the uniform application and continuing vitality of such a treaty;

Whereas failure to conclude a comprehensive treaty on the law of the sea would continue to subject United States commercial and military activities to the conflicting requirements and regulations of different countries; and

Whereas the United States has reviewed the draft treaty of the Third United Na-

tions Conference on the Law of the Sea and has decided to participate in the eleventh session of the Third Conference to be held in March and April of 1982: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That (a) it is the sense of the Congress that the successful conclusion of a comprehensive treaty on the law of the sea is of strategic importance to the United States.

(b) The Congress urges the United States delegation to the eleventh session of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea—

(1) to seek appropriate changes in the draft treaty of the Third Conference that would protect United States interests while recognizing that the draft treaty is composed of diverse, interlocking parts that represent the compromises reached among the multiplicity of interests represented at the Conference; and

(2) to seek the successful conclusion of a comprehensive international treaty on the law of the sea at the Third Conference at the earliest possible time.●

THE FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF CHARTER 1977 IN CZECHOSLO- VAKIA

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1982

● Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, Charter 1977, the Czechoslovak human rights movement, is celebrating its fifth anniversary. This group, now consisting of more than 1,000 courageous individuals from all walks of life was established in January 1977 to encourage the Czechoslovak authorities to act in accordance with their obligations flowing from various international documents, including the Helsinki Final Act and the U.N. Charter. Since that time the group has issued numerous reports and statements assessing how well the Czechoslovak Government has fulfilled its human rights and other obligations and calling upon the authorities to end practices not in accord with international human rights standards.

Due to these activities, Charter 1977 signatories have been subjected to brutal repression and given harsh prison sentences, in stark violation of the human rights provisions of the Helsinki Final Act, the U.N. Charter and other international documents, all of which have been signed by Czechoslovakia. At latest count, 44 members of Charter 1977 were in Czech prisons including such well-known and respected activists as Vaclav Havel, Rudolf Battek, Vaclav Benda, Jiri Dientsbier, Albert Cerny and Peter Uhl.

The imposition of martial law and the subsequent massive repression in Poland serves to highlight the continuing disregard for basic human rights and fundamental freedoms ev-

erywhere in Soviet-controlled Eastern Europe, but particularly in Czechoslovakia. Currently languishing in Czech prisons awaiting trial since May 1981 are eight human rights activists, six of whom are members of Charter 1977: Dr. Jirina Siklova, Dr. Milan Simecka, Karel Kyncl, Jiri Ruml, Jan Ruml, Eva Kanturkova, Jan Mlynarik and Dr. Jaromir Horec. These eight courageous citizens have been detained on trumped-up charges of subversion in collusion with a foreign power for their alleged contacts with two French journalists. Also awaiting trial on similar charges but temporarily free are six other Charter 1977 activists including Jiri Hajek, a former foreign minister.

The goal of the Czechoslovak authorities in proceeding with this travesty of justice is clear: They want to link Charter 1977 to foreign governments and thereby to discredit it once and for all in the eyes of the Czechoslovak public. But, such efforts are doomed to failure. The work of Charter 1977 and similar organizations in other East European countries has shown and will continue to show the world that the spark of freedom, that the striving for basic human dignity and human rights cannot be stamped out no matter how brutal the repression. On this fifth anniversary of Charter 1977, its work has never been more important, more urgent, or more inspiring that it is now.●

CURRENT EVENTS COMMEMO- RATES 80TH YEAR OF PUBLI- CATION

HON. SAM GEJDENSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1982

● Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, many of us, throughout our school years, were kept up-to-date on national news by reading the Weekly Reader family of publications. I am proud to have the editorial offices of the Weekly Reader family in the Second District of Connecticut.

In May of this year, Current Events—America's first school newspaper and one of the Weekly Reader publications—will celebrate its 80th year of publication. I have to admit that I'd never given any thought before to how school papers (which have now become as much of an institution as recess) got their start. In its January 25 issue, Current Events printed the following article in explanation:

HOW AMERICA'S FIRST SCHOOL NEWSPAPER WAS BORN

It was May 20, 1902. Teddy Roosevelt was President. Automobiles were still called "horseless carriages." The Wright brothers'

history-making flight was almost two years away. Radio, TV, and electric refrigerators didn't exist.

In Agawam, Mass., a group of students eagerly looked at the first issue of a new school publication called *Current Events*. The front-page story told about "an awful volcano eruption" on the island of Martinique in the West Indies. Other major stories in that first issue were about Spain's new "boy king," Cuba, a strike by Pennsylvania coal miners, and a riot by New York City housewives over the high prices of beef.

There were 12 news stories in the four small pages that made up the first issue of *Current Events*. And only a few hundred copies came off the press. But it marked the beginning of a new type of publication—a classroom newspaper.

A man named Charles Palmer Davis was behind the birth of *Current Events*. A former newspaper reporter and editor, Davis had settled on a farm in Agawam, Mass., shortly after 1900. One day Davis visited the one-room country school attended by his daughter. The school had 25 pupils in grades 1 through 5. As Davis watched, the children gave amazing recitations on the heroes of ancient Greek history. They rattled off difficult Greek names. They even spelled them correctly.

The teacher was proud of the children's performance. Davis listened with polite interest. Then he asked a question: "Who is President of the United States?"

The pupils sat in frozen silence. The teacher looked embarrassed. How could they be expected to know such things? They were used to studying "Subjects" in textbooks. But the modern world outside the classroom was to be lived in, not studied.

In the following months, Davis visited other schools and asked other questions about current affairs. The results were the same. The pupils could recite long lists of dusty facts. But they knew little or nothing about the history that was being made around them every day. One reason for their ignorance was quite simple. Neither radio nor TV existed in those days. And newspapers were too difficult for most young people to understand.

Davis then decided to publish his own paper—one written weekly just for students—that would clearly explain world and national news. Friends told Davis that his idea would never work. But, like Henry Ford with his horseless carriage, Davis went ahead anyway.

Thus, *Current Events* was born 80 years ago this May.

A lot has happened in those 80 years: 19 presidential elections; two world wars; the invention of radio, TV, computers; the atom bomb; moon-walks—all those exciting events that were once news and are now history. And Charles Palmer Davis' brainchild, *Current Events*, has covered them all.

In commemoration of its 80th Anniversary, *Current Events* is sponsoring a nationwide essay contest, the theme of which is "What a Free Press Means to Me." A free press is probably one of the best examples of the freedoms which we as Americans have come to take for granted. Having just returned from the Soviet Union, I have seen first hand what it is like for people who live in a nation where free speech is nonexistent. I believe it is important for our young people to be aware of just how privileged is the society in which they live. Exploring all of the possible interpretations of the meaning of a free press will help our students, as

well as the rest of us, understand the importance of our freedoms and remind us how hard we must work to insure those freedoms are never lost.

The contest, of course, will have its winners, and the national winner will receive a medal at a ceremony in the White House. But every young person who enters the contest is a winner in my book. Every student who takes the trouble to think about the contest theme and to submit 500 words on the subject will have helped remind us how fortunate we are to live in America and to be Americans. ●

REAGAN'S MASCOT IS HOOVER

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1982

● Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, during the brief administration of Gerald Ford we were subjected to the sight of a Republican President adopting Harry Truman as his mascot.

Now we have Ronald Reagan doing the same to Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

If Reagan wants a talisman, let him pick Herbert Hoover.

The following letter to the editor is from the February 14, 1982, New York Times:

ABRIDGED ROOSEVELT

To the Editor:

During a television program about Franklin D. Roosevelt, President Reagan implied that he was following F.D.R.'s lead: He quoted Roosevelt as saying that the Federal Government must get out of the welfare business—or, to use Roosevelt's own words, "must and shall quit this business of relief."

What Mr. Reagan neglected to mention was that in that same message to Congress, on Jan. 4, 1935, F.D.R. went on to say that it was the "duty" of the Federal Government to employ all of the unemployed people who were able to work—three and a half million of them. The Government did employ them.

Today there are about nine million unemployed and able to work. Is Mr. Reagan going to say that it is the Government's duty to employ them? If not, he really should stop quoting Roosevelt.

THOMAS H. ELIOT,
Cambridge, Mass. ●

IMPACT OF CUTS IN ENTITLEMENT PROGRAMS

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1982

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, I, would like to bring to my colleagues attention hearings I will be chairing over the next 2 weeks. The House Budget Committee Task Force on Entitlements, Uncontrollables, and Indexing has planned a series of hearings on the entitlement components of the Federal budget. Entitlement programs

account for about half of current Federal spending. Because of their cost they have been a key factor in the budget debate for several years. Cuts in entitlement spending also summon up some of the most controversial questions about the new budget proposal: equity, the "social safety net," burden shifting, and voluntarism. The task force has organized these hearings to examine these difficult questions and to assess the proper role of entitlements in Federal budget policy.

The task force, over 3 days, will hear testimony from representatives of State and local governments, volunteer relief agencies, Federal and State administrators of entitlement programs, U.S. industry and others. Dave Stockman will be testifying before the task force this Friday, February 26, at 10, in room 210, Cannon. Congress approved the administration's budget and tax programs last year which cut these programs for lower income people, while focusing overly large tax breaks on corporations and the rich. Now as the economic program is falling far short of its stated goals and the budget deficit is swelling to unprecedented levels, the administration is asking additional cuts in the same programs, and the question is whether we are asking the needy and the working poor to accept much more than their fair share of the burden of reducing Government spending. I believe the answer to that question is a resounding yes and that we must put an end to this type of economic policy which so badly penalizes the poor and the middle class while protecting the wealthy and many businesses. The task force will look at exactly what has been the impact of last year's cuts in entitlement programs and what can be expected to result if the President's recommendations for further cuts are accepted by Congress this year.

The schedule for the hearings follows, for your information:

Friday, February 26, morning (10:00 a.m.), David Stockman, Director, Office of Management and Budget.

Monday, March 1, morning (9:30 a.m.), social security, Paul Simmons, Deputy Commissioner, Social Security Administration.

Panel: Robert Myers, former Associate Commissioner for Policy, Social Security Administration and currently Executive Director of the National Commission on Social Security Reform; Robert Ball, former Commissioner, Social Security Administration; Dr. Rudolph Penner, American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research.

Higher education, panel: Dr. Lattie Coor, president, The University of Vermont; Dallas Martin, executive director, National Association of Student Financial Aid Administration.

Afternoon (1:30 p.m.), impact on entitlement reductions on children and families, Linda McMahon, Associate Commissioner, Office of Family Assistance; Teresa Hawkes, Director, Office of Program Coordination and Review, H.H.S.; Marian Wright Edelman, Children's Defense Fund; Ed Weaver,

American Public Welfare Association; Adele Blong, Center for Social Welfare Policy; Nancy Amidel, Food Research Action Council; Jane Wynn, American School Food Service Association.●

CLEAN AIR ACT DEBATE STIRS EMOTIONS IN CALIFORNIANS

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1982

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, as a representative of one of the most heavily air polluted districts in the country, I was shocked at the proposal to weaken the Clean Air Act as embodied in the bill H.R. 5252. What disappoints me is that H.R. 5252 is authored by some of our most distinguished colleagues on the House Energy and Commerce Committee with jurisdiction over reauthorization of this act.

It was with interest, therefore, that I read the recent Los Angeles Times editorial on the subject of Congressman DINGELL's bill, and the series of letters to the editor in response. For anyone who has not been to the Los Angeles area or to my district at the height of the air pollution season—it is one of our seasons out there—it might be difficult to understand the strong emotions generated by a bill clearly not in the best interests of the public that lives in this area. Far from the Washington political give and take, this public does not think that the gentleman from Michigan, with his automobile manufacturing constituency, has their best interests in mind. I want to join with my colleague from California (Mr. WAXMAN) in defending the integrity of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) in his letter to the editor of the Los Angeles Times, but also join him in his concern regarding the bill. Mr. WAXMAN has introduced his own legislation, much more responsible and responsive to the needs of the country for a good law.

I include the editorial and several letters to the editor, including the one from my colleague Mr. WAXMAN, as an indication of the concern being voiced by the public for insuring a strong and effective Clean Air Act.

The articles follow:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Jan. 24, 1982]
CLEANING UP AN ACT

When it comes to air quality, Rep. John D. Dingell (D-Mich.) plays dirty. That may seem a harsh judgment, but no more harsh than a bill that he is sponsoring to roll back automobile smog standards and to strip California of its right to enforce tougher air-quality standards than other states.

Dingell is chairman of the House Energy and Commerce Committee, with jurisdiction over the Clean Air Act, which must be revised or extended this year.

He also represents Detroit, where the auto industry has fought against pollution con-

trols for two decades and is fighting even harder now that the recession and foreign competition have plunged it into a depression.

Dingell has promoted weaker pollution laws behind the scenes for months, getting nowhere. He keeps running up against Rep. Henry A. Waxman (D-Los Angeles), who chairs the health and environment subcommittee for Dingell and refuses to consider weakening the clean-air law.

Now Dingell has gone public with a bill that, among other things, would double the legal limit for releasing nitrogen oxides through a tailpipe, weaken warranty protections for owners whose control devices fail, and relax efficiency tests for new controls on power plants and factories.

According to reports from Washington, Dingell also has let it be known that he is prepared to play rough from now on, either snatching clean-air legislation out of Waxman's subcommittee or bouncing Waxman out of his job if he refuses to cooperate.

What is at stake here for Dingell's district is about \$80 worth of pollution-control equipment that Detroit could leave out of every car if the standards were less strict. Estimates of potential savings run as high as \$300, but those assume that Detroit would stop installing small computers under the hood that monitor engine performance and increase fuel efficiency. Given the increased competition for higher mileage, it is not likely that the industry would abandon the computerized control devices.

What is at stake for Waxman's district—and every other part of the country where the air is already dirtier than the law allows—is a significant increase in nitrogen dioxide, one of the basic ingredients of photochemical smog.

Considering that the saving represents less than 1 percent of the cost of the average new car these days, that is not a fair trade.

Dingell and his co-sponsors call their bill a "compromise" effort, largely because it is less noisome than some earlier proposals he was promoting.

He also has the support of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, which calls his bill nothing more than an effort to "simplify and clarify" the Clean Air Act. There is some interesting history behind the choice of words.

Some months ago, Louis Harris sampled public opinion on clean-air laws, and found that 80 percent opposed any weakening of the basic act.

The chamber, unbelieving, commissioned its own poll. The results were much the same.

As Harry W. O'Neill, president of Opinion Research, which did the sampling for the chamber, explained his findings to The Times last month, a congressman will not stir up his voters just by fiddling with the Clean Air Act. In ways, for example, that only simplify and clarify.

But O'Neill said, if the public believes that a politician is trying to weaken the air-quality law, "then he's in trouble."

The message seems clear enough to us. Keep it clean, Mr. Dingell.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Feb. 8, 1982]

PROPOSED CHANGES IN CLEAN AIR ACT

(HENRY A. WAXMAN, Member of Congress, 24th District, California).

Although I very much welcomed The Times' ringing editorial endorsement (Jan. 24) of a strong Clean Air Act—to which I am fully committed as chairman of the Com-

merce Subcommittee on Health and the Environment—I must take exception to your unfair and misleading characterization of Rep. John Dingell (D-Mich.), the chairman of the full Commerce Committee, as a man who "plays dirty."

To be certain, I am extremely disappointed in Rep. Dingell's proposal to roll back, on a wholesale basis, automobile pollution standards. If enacted, there will be irreparable harm to public health and the decade-long effort to curb air pollution. But our disagreement on this issue is a clear exception to our long-standing collaboration on many others.

It is one matter to differ on policy and another to make such differences personal. Rep. Dingell is a strong and forceful advocate. But, that is not to say he has been unfair or underhanded. As a member of Congress for over two decades, and a man who succeeded his father in Washington, he has an abiding respect for the House and its members. While his policies are fair game, and, particularly in the case of the Clean Air Act, deserve the fullest debate, his character should not be called into question simply because he holds these views.

(Ward Elliott, president, Coalition for Clean Air, Santa Monica)

Bravo for your editorial. Congressman Dingell has been trying for many years to weaken the Clean Air Act and strip California of its authority to set stricter standards than the other states. Now he wants to double the amount of allowable oxides of nitrogen from auto exhaust, weaken warranty protections, and loosen controls on industrial pollution—and also to oust Congressman Waxman from jurisdiction over amendments to the Clean Air Act because Waxman has fought too hard, and too successfully, to keep the act strong.

Dingell told us soothingly last March that he did "not want the (act) gutted," and that "a scalpel, not a meat ax, is the tool I want to see used for both stationary and mobile sources." He may want a scalpel for smog, but he plainly wants a meat ax for the Clean Air Act and its defenders.

Perhaps he hopes that the public, 80% of which oppose weakening the act, will not notice his sleight of hand. Your editorial will help prevent that and give a boost to those who believe that the act would better be strengthened than weakened.

(Joan Dickson-Smith, Chair, Air Quality Subcommittee, Sierra Club Southern California Regional Conservation Committee, Los Angeles)

On behalf of more than 40,000 Sierra Club members in Southern California, I want you to know that we agree with your editorial. We agree with you that HR 5252 is bad news for people who want to have air that is healthy to breathe.

This bill is, evidently, a bill that starts with the premise that you give the auto industry anything it wants.

That is totally unacceptable for us in Southern California. We cannot afford to roll back auto emission standards and gut the California waiver enforcement program—there is nothing in HR 5252 that we can accept.

Our members solidly and wholeheartedly oppose any weakening of the basic act, and we thank you for pointing out to your large readership that HR 5252 is not what it claims to be.

Congressman Waxman has been a long-time champion for retaining a strong Clean Air Act, and we support and thank him for his efforts. Congressman Jerry Lewis (R-San Bernardino and Riverside) has introduced House Resolution 252, which calls for retaining a strong Clean Air Act, and we support and thank him and his co-sponsors for these efforts. Now we want to thank you for your exposure of the "simplify and clarify" claims of 5252, and hope that you will continue to urge governmental and regulatory agencies to remember the Harris poll findings: the people do not want their politicians to weaken the Clean Air Act.

(John Roos, Pomona)

I agree that HR 5252 means disaster for our already poor air in the Los Angeles Basin. California can't afford to roll back auto emissions limits.

Living most of my 29 years in Southern California, I've seen lots of smog, and was finally beginning to see some hope in its gradual deletion. Now comes this bill to undo all the hard work that was done before. We need to become more responsible about the air we breathe (along with the poor plants and animals).●

NEED FOR A BAN ON CHEMICAL WEAPONS

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1982

● Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month the President submitted his fiscal year 1983 budget request to the Congress. Included in the overall budget submission was a request for \$258 billion for the Department of Defense. Mr. Speaker, in this time of difficult and painful budget cuts in domestic social programs, Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle have properly indicated that the quarter-of-a-trillion dollar budget request for defense expenditures in fiscal year 1983 must be reduced.

As many of our colleagues from both parties have pointed out, the nearly \$100 billion deficit proposed by the administration for fiscal year 1983 must be reduced if we are to return to a solvent and sound economy.

As we in Congress work to make these necessary changes to the administration's fiscal year 1983 budget request, national security, foreign policy, and fiscal interests require a close and careful scrutiny of the administration's budget request for the production of a new generation of lethal chemical weapons; that is, the binary.

In conjunction with the Presidential certification for binary production submitted to the Congress on February 8, 1982, the Department of Defense issued a statement outlining U.S. chemical warfare policy and the administration's chemical budget for fiscal year 1983.

The President is requesting \$705 million for the chemical program, includ-

ing over \$100 million for the binary program. Current estimates place the overall cost of the chemical program in excess of \$10 billion.

As to the foreign policy impact of the administration's fiscal year 1983 binary request, the administration's proposal to separate the development and production of binary chemical weapons from the issue of deployment undermines the very justification for the production of these new lethal chemical weapons.

Also very questionable from a foreign policy perspective is the argument by Defense officials that the administration must begin now to produce binary chemical weapons in order to deter the Soviets from using such weapons in a European conflict. The plain fact is that unless these munitions are prepositioned where they would be used; that is, in Europe, their value as a deterrent to the Soviets is meaningless. Surely the administration cannot believe the Soviets will view chemical weapons positioned on American soil as a disincentive to Soviet first use of chemical munitions in a European war.

Fearful of the adverse impact a binary production decision would have on vital foreign policy priorities of the U.S. Government and the NATO alliance, such as the TNF decision and the situation in Poland, I wrote to President Reagan on January 7, 1982:

Pursuing the production of the new binary chemical weapon would only undermine these far more important and fundamental foreign policy interests by generating a public reaction which would preclude responsible European leaders from acting cooperatively with the United States.

In that same letter I also encouraged the President to address NATO's well-known inadequate defensive/protective capabilities in the chemical area by recommending the necessary budgetary support to redress these deficiencies as opposed to pursuing the production of the binary.

Mr. Speaker, over the past 5 years, the U.S. Government has pursued a ban on chemical warfare in both bilateral and multilateral fora. The Reagan administration, however, is currently planning to pursue arms control talks only before the Committee on Disarmament, while leaving the United States-Soviet chemical arms control talks in indefinite suspension. Accordingly, I encourage my colleagues to join me in urging the administration to reconsider this decision and take the lead in calling upon the Soviets to join the United States in pursuing a verifiable agreement banning the production, stockpiling, and use of lethal chemical weapons.●

NATIONAL POW-MIA RECOGNITION DAY: A FITTING TRIBUTE

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1982

● Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin, Mr. ASPIN, has introduced legislation, House Joint Resolution 393, to declare April 9 of each year as National POW-MIA Recognition Day to recognize and pay tribute to all former prisoners of war, as well as those still missing, and to their families for whom the horror of war never really ended.

I would like to take this opportunity to commend my colleague and to join as a cosponsor, as I share his concern and feel it appropriate to show our gratitude and appreciation for the selfless service these men gave our country.

The Veterans' Administration estimates that there were 142,227 servicemen captured and interned since World War I. In addition, an estimated 92,761 servicemen were lost in combat and never recovered. In each of these past wars, our prisoners of war have performed a special service and sacrifice. Further, they have been confronted with the added burden of loneliness and hardship which has fallen upon them and in many cases, this burden was intensified as they were subjected to inhumane treatment by the enemy, in direct violation of common human compassion, ethical standards, and international obligations.

It is imperative that we not forget the hardships and horrors experienced by our prisoners and missing in action of our past conflicts. The harrowing nightmare of POW-MIA status affects the lives of family and friends dramatically. Therefore, I feel it is altogether appropriate that all Americans recognize the special debt we owe these Americans held prisoner during wartime. It is equally important and appropriate that we remember the unresolved casualties of war, our soldiers whose fates were never known, and the families, friends, and relatives of these men whose pain and suffering continue.

I call upon my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join in honoring these Americans who made a special sacrifice for our country by cosponsoring Mr. ASPIN's bill. By designating April 9, the day in 1942 when the largest single group of Americans became POW's with the surrender of the troops in Corregidor and the Bataan Peninsula in the Philippines, our Nation can show its gratitude to these men who endured the hardships

of combat, and the rigors and privation of captivity. In this way we can also honor those whose fate is yet unresolved and assure their families and friends they are not forgotten. This day would provide a fitting forum to demonstrate our unified concern for their past sacrifices and future realities.

In addition, I am also supporting efforts to inter an unknown soldier from the Vietnam war in the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Arlington National Cemetery. In 1976, I supported legislation calling for this, and Congress passed legislation, now Public Law 93-94, appropriating money for the express purpose of preparing a vault at the existing tomb to receive a Vietnam unknown soldier. Construction has been completed for years, however the vault still remains empty, due to the fact that with today's highly technical methods of identification, most—but not all—of the remains have been identified.

While our combat participation in the Vietnam war may have been a grievous error, the men who served and died in this conflict nevertheless deserve every recognition and honor. The courage and conviction, determination and devotion that they displayed in a strange, distant war must place them in the very front ranks of all heroes in our history. It is my fervent hope that Vietnam combatants will receive the same tribute as the soldiers from other wars. ●

HIGH TECHNOLOGY AND EDUCATION

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1982

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, a recent Washington Post editorial noted that "even when the recovery comes, the unemployment rate will remain higher than it was before the current recession * * *. The economy is changing rapidly, and it is leaving the labor force behind."

We cannot allow this to happen. We must insure ample opportunity for workers and students to prepare for careers in the rapidly growing, high-technology industries. Workers with obsolete skills must be able to turn to job-training programs and the vocational education system for help. Public schools must strive to enhance their basic curriculum with a greater emphasis on science and computer education. We can enhance these opportunities by targeting Federal educational and training efforts at providing the skills demanded by these growing industries.

I will soon introduce a bill to amend the Vocational Education Act to stim-

ulate the training of electronic and computer technicians. Well paying technical jobs in these industries are going unfilled because our vocational education system cannot meet the growing industry demand.

I am inserting the editorial to which I referred into the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 30, 1982]

THE CHANGING JOB MARKET

More people are now unemployed than at any time since the Depression. It's also likely that, even when recovery comes, the unemployment rate will remain higher than it was before the current recession. Partly that is because severe unemployment upsets normal career patterns, discourages employers from investing in the training of workers and accustoms workers to relying on unemployment insurance for at least part of their income. But something else is at work, too. The economy is changing rapidly, and it is leaving the labor force behind.

Labor market forecasters see a burgeoning of jobs in occupations that didn't even exist two decades ago. Engineers and computer programmers are already in short supply and likely to become more so as the defense buildup proceeds. There are also new demands for people trained in such exotic subjects as genetic engineering and design and management of fully automated production lines. Meanwhile, less-skilled jobs will be vanishing as government shrinks, clerkships are replaced by automated filing systems, and robots take over from assembly-line workers.

Left to itself, industry will, no doubt, meet its own needs for skilled workers. It may do that, however, in ways that are painful to many people and costly for the nation. For example, jobs may be exported—or workers imported—at higher cost than if the unemployed were trained to fill them. Labor-saving automation undertaken without regard to the long-term costs of capital and energy may reduce rather than increase the productivity of the nation's resources. And a large and growing number of more or less permanently unemployed is not only a major social problem but a likely source of backlash against needed industrial change.

The administration has spent generously to stimulate additional investment in plant and machinery. Its policies, however, seem not to recognize that labor is an equally important factor in production. Much of the CETA system has been dismantled and the state-run Employment Service—a major placement agent for lower-skilled workers—has been cut by a third. More cuts are apparently planned. These programs were far from perfect, but they worked reasonably well, and much has been learned about how to make them work better.

The House and Senate labor committees have reasonable proposals for replacing CETA when it expires this year. Developing human capital—no less than upgrading plants and machinery—takes time and money, however, and the Reagan program calls for fast results and lower budgets. But it calls for higher productivity, too. Administration planners might want to remember that fancy equipment can't be designed, installed, operated and maintained without a skilled work force on the job. ●

A TRIBUTE TO ALBERT SHOOK

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1982

● Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, Albert Shook, a constituent of mine from Montrose, N.Y., exemplifies the community spirit and voluntarism which has helped people become valued members of society. Mr. Shook has devoted 65 years of his life to Scouting and youth programs in the Peekskill, N.Y., area. At least two generations of young people have benefited from Albert Shook's dedication and commitment to demonstrating how to achieve self-sufficiency and build character.

Mr. Shook began his career in Scouting as a member of Peekskill Troop No. 1 about the time of World War I. He became an Eagle Scout and has distinguished himself by earning the Gold, Silver, and Bronze Leaf, along with 47 merit badges. As a Scout leader for many years, Mr. Shook has worked with the Peekskill Rotary Club's sponsored Troop No. 42. Mr. Shook also spent his career as a police officer working closely with the youth in the Peekskill area. In a well-deserved presentation, he received the Rotary Club's 50th charter award Friday.

As the Federal Government begins the process of relying more on the individual's contribution to society and the spirit of voluntarism, people all over the United States can look to Albert Shook as a shining example of what can be accomplished—that one person can make a difference. ●

HUNGARIAN FREEDOM DAY

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1982

● Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, on March 15, thousands of Americans of Hungarian descent in southwestern Pennsylvania will formally observe that nation's struggle for freedom from Austrian rule in 1848.

Two groups in the city of McKeesport, Pa., which work unceasingly to perpetuate and honor the customs and traditions of their homeland, have scheduled a special program to commemorate "Hungarian Freedom Day." The organizations, whose reputations extend far beyond the city's boundaries, are the Magyar Social Circle and the Magyar Pioneers.

The ancestral pride of these people is reflected in a letter sent to President Reagan by Mr. Ernest J. Zsemko, president of the Social Circle, and Mr.

Joseph Molnar, president of the Pioneers. It is my pleasure to insert a copy of that letter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the attention of my colleagues.

MAGYAR PIONEERS AND
MAGYAR SOCIAL CIRCLE,
McKeesport, Pa., February 2, 1982.

HON. RONALD W. REAGAN,
President of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

MR. PRESIDENT: There are many people in the United States that have nationalistic ties with the country and people of Hungary. Since these ties are very strong, many of us would like to keep alive these customs and traditions. One special tradition we would like to keep alive would be Hungarian Freedom Day of March 15, 1848.

March 15, 1848 was the struggle for freedom from the Austrian rule. In 1848 a revolt broke out led by Lajos Kossuth. Russia helped Austria put down the rebellion. Austria was later defeated and the Austrian power in Hungary was shaken.

Centuries before they fought the Turkish invaders and saved Western Civilization and Christianity for the rest of the world. Just as a passing note, the Pope at that time acknowledged the Magyar efforts by adding an additional tier to the St. Stephen Crown, making it a triple tiered crown with a cross on top, and issued a ruling that every Catholic Church in the world would ring their bells in gratitude for what the Magyars accomplished. Thus we feel it proper here in the United States, as descendants of those Magyar ancestors, that the Hungarian Freedom Day should be properly remembered by the Magyar Social Circle and the Magyar Pioneers of the City of McKeesport.

The cultural influence of these two groups extends well beyond the city limits, covering the greater portion of our state.

Respectfully yours,

ERNEST ZSEMKO,
President, Magyar Social Circle.

JOSEPH MOLNAR,
President, Magyar Pioneers. ●

NATO'S SOUTHERN FLANK

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1982

● Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, the Heritage Foundation has gained a solid reputation for insightful analysis of political events. The publications of this Washington-based think tank receive wide attention for their credibility and competence. In one of their publications, the National Security Record, there is an article entitled "NATO's Southern Flank." This article is of the highest order in terms of its political insight. It not only provides an overview of the U.S. strategic relationship with Greece and Turkey but gives the reader an intelligent grasp of the recent political events in these Balkan nations. In addition to carefully exploring the political events in that strategic part of the world, the article presents possible policy options that the United States may wish to

consider in pursuing a policy that will strengthen our relationships with Greece and Turkey.

The article follows:

"NATO's Southern Flank," from the National Security Record No. 41, January 1982.

NATO'S SOUTHERN FLANK

The victory of Andreas Papandreaou's Panhellenic Socialist Party (PASOK) in the October Greek elections has brought the erosion of NATO's southern flank sharply into focus. A major theme of Papandreaou's campaign was that Turkey posed a greater threat to Greece than the Soviet Union, a contention that strikes at the heart of the consensus that binds the alliance together. He made it clear that in principle he dislikes Greek participation in NATO and the European Community, but is willing to maintain its membership in both provided major adjustments are made in Greece's status. Since taking office he has demonstrated his resolve in carrying out his agenda by beginning talks to renegotiate the position of Greece in relation to the other Western nations.

The seriousness of this development is shown by Prime Minister Papandreaou's disruption of the December NATO defense ministers' conference. The conference had been organized to address the single most serious internal problem facing the alliance—the growth of a "peace movement" opposed to the modernization of NATO tactical and theater nuclear weapons, and encouraged by its more radical elements to seek a "neutral" stance between the superpowers. Its influence was temporarily checked by President Reagan's bold challenge for the Soviet Union to accept a "zero option" dismantling all theater nuclear missiles. But the NATO governments fully realize that the movement will regain its influence tenfold unless wide divergences in official American and European views on such issues as nuclear strategy, coordinated policies outside the European theater, and the nature of the threat posed by the Soviet Union are bridged.

The defense ministers' conference had expected to deal with these issues, formulating and reviewing future steps to strengthen the alliance. An especially productive meeting had been anticipated, at least partially because of the good working relationship established by the Reagan Administration's efforts to expand consultations with the allied governments. Instead, it had to deal with a series of demands and obstructive actions by Papandreaou, present in his capacity as Defense Minister. These included a demand for a NATO guarantee to shield Greece from its fellow alliance member, Turkey; threats of blocking Spain's invitation to join NATO to show solidarity with the Spanish Socialist Party; and vetoing the final communique.

Papandreaou took the defense minister's portfolio in addition to his post as Prime Minister to dramatize his intention of pursuing his electoral campaign demands, which include:

A guarantee against attack by Turkey

This guarantee could come as a statement that "Greece's borders are guaranteed against any threat from any direction," to excuse NATO from mentioning Turkey by name.

Renegotiation of the status of U.S. military bases on Greek soil

Papandreaou wants to begin discussions on the status of these bases that will lead to their ultimate removal. In the interim he demands greater compensation and stricter regulation of their use.

Withdrawal of all nuclear weapons from Greek soil

This will be one of the first demands made at the talks over U.S. basing rights in Greece. Papandreaou has also declared an intention of sponsoring a nuclear-free zone throughout the Balkans.

Renegotiation of the terms under which Greece reentered the NATO integrated military command

At the Brussels NATO defense ministers' conference Papandreaou stated that Greece had already begun a "process of disengagement" from it. The Greek government had pulled out of the command in 1974 after the Turkish invasion of Cyprus, and only re-entered in 1980.

Complete control of the Aegean Sea airspace

Before 1974 Greek military air traffic controllers had complete authority for NATO operations in the Aegean airspace. When Greece withdrew from the NATO military command, NATO had no choice other than to transfer responsibility to Turkey. Under the re-entry plan sponsored by NATO commander General Bernard Rogers, Greece and Turkey agreed to share this duty. This arrangement is attacked by Papandreaou as a concession of joint sovereignty over the Aegean to the Turks.

It is important to understand that these are not perceived as extreme demands by many Greeks. Greek-U.S. relations were often strained even under former Prime Minister Karamanlis' New Democracy Party. Both Greece and Turkey have had great difficulty in maintaining the institutions of democratic Western nations. In many ways they share as much with the non-industrialized nations of the Middle East. This strain, coupled with often insensitive actions taken by the United States and the West European nations over the past fifteen years, have led to an unstable situation that could have a drastically adverse impact on the health of the NATO alliance.

GENESIS OF THE CRISIS

Although the antagonism between Greek and Turk is legendary, there was relatively little conflict between them from the end of the Second World War until the mid-1970s. This was partially due to a series of agreements between the two neighbors made in the inter-war and immediate post-war periods that settled their population and border disputes. But a more important factor was the entry of Greece into the European Community. The reimposition of civil order in Turkey by the military government that took power in October 1980 was seen by the United States, although not by most European governments, as a further sign that the problems in the region were on the mend. But the electoral victory of PASOK has given rise to the possibility that Greece may again leave the alliance, as a direct antagonist with Turkey.

IMPACT ON NATO

The seriousness of this possibility has to be evaluated in terms of Soviet goals and capabilities in the area, as well as its influence upon the stability of the alliance as a whole. The main Soviet goal is to weaken this link

between Europe and the Middle East. Control or domination of either Greece or Turkey would:

Give the Soviet Union control of vital Mediterranean sea-lanes carrying Middle East oil to the West;

Gain it an important say in the outcome of the Cypriot and Lebanese conflicts;

Gain important air routes for Soviet allies and proxies in the Middle East and Africa;

Isolate Israel;

Deprive NATO of a vital bridgehead for consolidating its position in the Middle East.

Even under current conditions the Soviet Union possesses a clear superiority in regional military assets, focused in land-based aircraft, its Mediterranean squadron, its ground forces in the Balkans, and its proxy assets in states such as Libya and Syria. Military analysts consider the most likely scenario in the event of a Soviet attack limited to this theater to be a short, fierce struggle for air superiority ending with a Soviet victory over the out of date planes of Greece and Turkey. Attempts by the United States to intervene with carrier air and any available air support from NATO Central would be too late and isolated to effect the issue. (This is even more true since the U.S. has halved its carrier presence to one ship following the 1979 Iranian crisis). A ground attack on the Bosphorus and Dardanelles launched from Soviet and Warsaw Pact forces in Bulgaria would follow, after which U.S. surface forces would be cleared from the Eastern Mediterranean. U.S. submarines could continue to operate until the surface forces had been eliminated.

MILITARY BALANCE ON NATO'S SOUTHERN FLANK

	NATO	Warsaw Pact	Soviet contribution
Total combat troops and direct support	859,000	550,000	225,000
Armored divisions	2	13	10
Other (mechanized, infantry, paratroop)	32	50	30
Tanks	8,000	13,000	9,500
Aircraft:			
Attack	425	350	250
Interceptors	225	460	400
Naval combatants	103	101	101

Adapted from John Collins, U.S.-Soviet Military Balance, 1980.

Static force comparisons, such as the preceding chart, do not adequately convey the imbalance of regional forces in favor of the Soviet Union. For example, NATO superiority in ground forces is produced by the large but ill-equipped standing army of half million men maintained by Turkey and the two hundred thousand man Greek army. The bulk of these forces are deployed against each other; for example, Turkey maintains only three divisions on its eastern border with the Soviet Union. Figures on aircraft are also misleading, for they include U.S. planes over 2,000 miles away in Spain while omitting the enormous number of aircraft deployed in those Soviet Military Districts immediately across the Black Sea. Intervention by Israel onto the NATO side could delay the outcome long enough to permit the United States to commit additional forces, but only if it were not occupied with attacks from other quarters.

At the same time, political instability and declining economic growth led to military coups in both countries. It is interesting to note the contrast in the nature and scale of military intervention in each country. While the two Turkish coups resulted in relatively temporary periods of control, ending each time with a peaceful transition to civilian

rule, the military government which overthrew the monarchy in Greece in 1967 was itself removed only after clumsily provoking a Turkish invasion of Cyprus.

The 1974 Cyprus crisis marked the beginning of the erosion of NATO's southern flank. The Soviet Union had demonstrated its ability to intervene in the Eastern Mediterranean by its support of the Arab forces in the 1973 Yom Kippur War. Its naval and air presence already rivaled that of the United States. But the failure of the United States to intervene in Cyprus, either to halt the coup by Greek Cypriot officers working with the support of the Greek military government, or to stop the Turkish invasion which caused occupation of almost 40 percent of the island, resulted in the estrangement of both parties. Greece was infuriated by the failure of the United States to halt the Turkish occupation of Cyprus and the perceived favoritism with which it had treated the now discredited Greek military government. Turkey was equally angered by the embargo of military sales and cut-off of economic aid imposed by Congress.

The past seven years have seen a slow improvement in U.S. relations with both nations, and of each with the other. Although hindered by the inability of either Turkish party to restore civil order, real progress was made, culminating with the lifting of the arms embargo to Turkey, the re-entry of Greece into the NATO command, and the threat posed by Stalin's occupation of Eastern Europe, his sponsoring revolutionary movements in both nations in the late 1940s, and his claim of large portions of eastern Turkey. These expansionist moves led to the Truman Doctrine and massive U.S. military and economic aid to the two nations. The high point of this period of post-war cooperation came in 1952 when both Greece and Turkey joined the NATO alliance. The late 1950s was a period of rapid economic growth for the two, and they were granted associate membership in the European Common Market.

This period of coexistence began to come apart in 1960, when the British granted independence to their colony of Cyprus. Agitation for *enosis*, or union with Greece, was favored by the Greek majority, who comprised four-fifths of the island's population, but opposed by the Turkish minority. This led to strife between the two communities which broke out into civil war in 1963. An agreement signed by British, Greek, Turkish and Cypriot leaders ended the hostilities by establishing a republic with a president elected from and by the Greek community and a vice-president by and from the Turkish community.

The Cyprus dispute awakened the old hostilities in the region, and led to three other disputes re-emerging:

The issue of sovereignty in the Aegean, including control of oil and mineral rights and of the Aegean airspace;

Disputes over NATO's command structure in the region, which began when Greece began to fortify islands demilitarized by the 1923 Treaty of Lausanne and the 1947 Treaty of Paris;

Economic conflicts which have culminated with Greece's admission to the European Community in 1981 as a full member.

Although these military capabilities give the Soviet Union leverage, it is unlikely that conflict would be restricted to this single region. Soviet aims are much better served by exploiting tensions between Greece, Turkey and their NATO partners, creating anti-Western and anti-American sentiments,

and destabilizing their internal political systems. Ironically in view of the present situation in Greece, the Soviet Union has devoted more of its efforts to Turkey. There are several reasons for this—the lower level of prosperity in Turkey, its (albeit secularized) Islamic culture, and the sense of betrayal sparked by the 1974-78 U.S. arms embargo have in many ways made Turkey an easier target. But the most important factor is that although participation of both is essential to the alliance, loss of Greece would in no way compare to loss of Turkey. There are two reasons for this: having pulled out, Greece is the state more likely to return, as it did under Prime Minister Karamanlis; and of the two, Turkey occupies the more vital strategic position.

Therefore, Soviet policy toward Turkey over the past decade has focused on two areas: overtures, to the weak and often corrupt Turkish civilian governments, and attempts to destabilize the nation by active support of both left and right wing extremist terrorists. In both areas the Soviet Union had achieved remarkable success. Examples of diplomatic successes include:

Turkish readiness to allow the Soviet Union to conduct overflights to its Arab clients during the Yom Kippur War;

Turkish willingness to accept Soviet classification of the Kiev-class aircraft carriers as an "anti-submarine cruisers" to permit passage through the Turkish straits in violation of the Montreux Convention;

Prime Minister Ecevit's declaration that Soviet permission would have to be secured in advance of American U-2 flights over Turkey for the purposes of SALT verification;

Signing of a series of accords from 1972 on that culminated in Ecevit's astounding May 1978 declaration that the Soviet Union was not a threat to Turkey;

Large increase in Soviet aid projects to Turkey, resulting in the presence of thousands of Soviets.

But it was the success of Soviet support for terrorism within Turkey that checked the slide of Turkey into "non-aligned" status. Clear although circumstantial evidence links the terrorist arms of both the radical left parties and the fascist National Action Party to the Soviet Bloc where they received supplies, weapons, training, and safe havens. By 1980 over twenty-five people a day were being killed in terrorist attacks. It was this that impelled the military to launch a coup and an immediate crackdown on civil disorder. A surprise raid on the NAP headquarters yielded a membership list that decapitated the movement. Operations against left groups have taken longer but appear to be successful. One Turkish officer has said that the small arms munitions captured in the past year would be sufficient to reequip the entire Turkish army. The military has supervised voting for a new Constituent Assembly, and although it has not yet established a firm date for transition to civilian rule, U.S. officials monitoring the situation have been informed that it hopes to do so before the end of 1983. It has even managed to solve some of the more pressing economic problems, easing a potential conflict area with Greece.

However, even though the Soviet Union lost ground in Turkey following the coup, the reaction of the West European NATO partners must please it. The European Economic Community has been blocking an aid package for Turkey worth about \$140 million. West Germany and Denmark are expected to drop out of an operation to pro-

vide \$1 billion to help Turkey's balance of payments gap, on the grounds that the army has not set a date for returning Turkey to civilian control. Such actions illustrate why the Soviet Union is willing to exercise patience. It illustrates also the current fragmented nature of the alliance, and underlines the danger posed by a government in Greece which emphasizes the points that divide, rather than unify, the members of NATO.

U.S. POLICY AND THE SOUTHERN FLANK

The United States can play an enormously constructive role in this area. Moving immediately to support for Turkey to compensate for Greece's departure is a tempting option, but one that will not only antagonize the other West European NATO members and lead to a rupture with Greece, but also not be particularly useful for Turkey. Instead, the United States should concentrate its efforts on emphasizing the issues that unify the alliance:

The United States should move to mediate between the Turkish military government and its West European allies. Turkey receives nearly as much economic aid from Germany as from the United States.

The seriousness of Papandreaou's threats should be closely scrutinized. A good part of his rhetoric could well be bluff, designed to strengthen his hand for renegotiating Greece's position within both NATO and the EC. Papandreaou also has domestic constraints on his actions—the Greek Presidency is controlled by his political opposition, and the army is always present as a check on extreme action.

Make settlement of the Cyprus dispute a top priority. Turkey is moving to replace Greek Cypriots expelled from its zone with settlers from the Turkish mainland. If the issue is left unsettled for much longer, the dispute could become as intractable as the Palestinian question.

Prepare a fall-back plan for NATO Mediterranean options in the event that Greece does withdraw from the military command structure, emphasizing means of returning Greece to the alliance. The new membership of Spain should make this problem somewhat easier.

In the interim, the temptation is strong to push for a rearmament of Turkey to compensate for the years lost under the arms embargo. Turkey badly needs rearming—its military equipment has been described as "Korean War era." It would be better not to make radical departures from the arms transfers and sales already planned. Not only could this make it impossible to achieve the equally important diplomatic objectives listed above, but it could easily trigger a congressional backlash, leaving Turkey—and NATO's southern flank—with nothing.●

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when sched-

uled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in committee scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, February 23, 1982, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

FEBRUARY 24

9:00 a.m.
Select on Intelligence
Legislation and the Rights of Americans Subcommittee
Closed briefing on intelligence matters.
S-407, Capitol

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
To hold hearings to review current economic conditions.
1114 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Business, Trade, and Tourism Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the economic impact of tourism.
235 Russell Building

Finance
To continue hearings to review those items in the President's budget for fiscal year 1983 which fall within its legislative jurisdiction and consider recommendations which it will make thereon to the Budget Committee.
2221 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources
To continue oversight hearings on the southern Nevada culinary workers' pension fund.
4232 Dirksen Building

*Labor and Human Resources
Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on activities of the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism and the National Institute on Drug Abuse, Department of Health and Human Services.
6226 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Budget
To continue hearings to review the administration's proposed budget for fiscal year 1983.
6202 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works
To continue hearings to review those items in the President's budget for fiscal year 1983 which fall within its legislative jurisdiction and consider recommendations which it will make thereon to the Budget Committee, receiving testimony from officials of the Federal Highway Administration.
4200 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs
Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations
To continue hearings to investigate certain fraudulent commodity investments.
3302 Dirksen Building

Joint Economic
To hold hearings on the effects of the administration's proposed new federalism program on State economics.
318 Russell Building

2:00 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Regulation Subcommittee
Joint oversight hearings with the Subcommittee on Water and Power on hydroelectric development and licensing procedures.
3110 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources
Water and Power Subcommittee
Joint oversight hearings with the Subcommittee on Energy Regulation on hydroelectric development and licensing procedures.
3110 Dirksen Building

FEBRUARY 25

8:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To receive testimony from public witnesses on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for certain Indian programs.
1318 Dirksen Building

9:00 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings on Senate Resolution 231, providing for an inventory of U.S. assets, to estimate their market value, identify which are unneeded and can be sold, and recommend legislative and administrative actions to streamline the liquidation process.
3110 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
To continue hearings to review current economic conditions.
1114 Dirksen Building

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To resume hearings on the conduct of monetary policy.
5302 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Business, Trade, and Tourism Subcommittee
To continue hearings on the economic impact of tourism.
235 Russell Building

Commerce, Science and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
357 Russell Building

Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 53, S. 1761, S. 1975, and S. 1992, bills extending the effects of certain provisions of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.
2228 Dirksen Building

Judiciary
*Courts Subcommittee and Agency Administration Subcommittee
To hold joint hearings on S. 1847, establishing a congressional process for au-

thorizing funds to Federal courts, and limiting certain pay increases for Federal judges.

2221 Dirksen Building

Small Business

To hold hearings on encouraging small business investment in free enterprise in nationally distressed areas.

424 Russell Building

Special on Aging

To hold hearings to examine the impact of the administration's proposed budget cuts in the food stamp and nutrition programs on the elderly.

4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Armed Services

To resume hearings to review those items in the President's budget for fiscal year 1983 which fall within its legislative jurisdiction and consider recommendations which it will make thereon to the Budget Committee, focusing on Navy/Marine Corps programs.

212 Russell Building

Environment and Public Works

Business meeting, to resume markup of proposed amendments to the Clean Air Act (Public Law 95-95).

318 Russell Building

Foreign Relations

Western Hemisphere Affairs Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the human rights situation in Nicaragua.

4221 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs

Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations

To continue hearings to investigate certain fraudulent commodity investments.

3302 Dirksen Building

Judiciary

Juvenile Justice Subcommittee

To hold hearings on legal matters involving abused children.

5110 Dirksen Building

Select on Intelligence

Closed briefing on intelligence matters.

S-407, Capitol

2:00 p.m.

Select on Intelligence

Analysis and Production Subcommittee

To hold closed hearings on the quality of analysis with regard to intelligence information.

S-407, Capitol

FEBRUARY 26

9:30 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

Agricultural Research and General Legislation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

324 Russell Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings on the nomination of J. J. Simmons III, of New Jersey, to be a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

235 Russell Building

Select on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings to review those items in the President's budget for fiscal year 1983 which fall within its legislative jurisdiction and consider recommendations which it will make thereon to the Budget Committee, focusing on Indian programs of the Depart-

ments of Education, Labor, Health and Human Services, and Housing and Urban Development.

6226 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for activities of the Assistant Secretary for Health, scientific activities overseas, and retirement pay for commissioned officers, Department of Health and Human Services.

1114 Dirksen Building

Appropriations

Transportation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the U.S. Coast Guard.

1318 Dirksen Building

Armed Services

Preparedness Subcommittee

To hold hearings on Air Force operational readiness.

212 Russell Building

Environment and Public Works

To resume hearings to review those items in the President's budget for fiscal year 1983 which fall within its legislative jurisdiction and consider recommendations which it will make thereon to the Budget Committee, receiving testimony from officials of the Environmental Protection Agency.

4200 Dirksen Building

Judiciary

Security and Terrorism Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine the presence of Cuban intelligence operations within the United States.

2228 Dirksen Building

11:00 a.m.

*Judiciary

To hold hearings on pending nominations.

4232 Dirksen Building

Rules and Administration

Business meeting, to consider committee resolutions requesting funds for operating expenses for 1982, and to promulgate regulations to implement the postal patron provisions of Public Law 97-69, strengthening and clarifying the congressional franking law.

301 Russell Building

2:00 p.m.

Select on Indian Affairs

To continue hearings to review those items in the President's budget for fiscal year 1983 which fall within its legislative jurisdiction and consider recommendations which it will make thereon to the Budget Committee.

6226 Dirksen Building

MARCH 1

9:30 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

Agricultural Research and General Legislation Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

324 Russell Building

Finance

International Trade Subcommittee

To hold hearings to review administration plans and the approach of the United States to the meeting in November 1982 of trade ministers of countries that adhere to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

2221 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on the nomination of Howard E. Douglas, of Virginia, to be U.S. Coordinator for Refugee Affairs and Ambassador at Large, Department of State.

4221 Dirksen Building

Judiciary

Constitution Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 53, S. 1761, S. 1975, and S. 1992, bills extending the effects of certain provisions of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

2228 Dirksen Building

Select on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 1858, declaring that the United States holds in trust certain lands in Nevada for the Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California, and to provide for the transfer of certain other lands in Nevada to the U.S. Forest Service, and H.R. 4364, declaring that the United States holds in trust certain land in Pima County, Ariz. for the Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona.

4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Environment and Public Works

To resume hearings to review those items in the President's budget for fiscal year 1983 which fall within its legislative jurisdiction and consider recommendations which it will make thereon to the Budget Committee, receiving testimony from officials of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior.

4200 Dirksen Building

Select on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings on the Department of the Interior's proposed plan for the use and distribution of Wichita and Caddo Indian judgment funds awarded by the U.S. Court of Claims.

4232 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Judiciary

Constitution Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed legislation modifying the method of awarding attorney's fees in civil rights cases.

2228 Dirksen Building

MARCH 2

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Office of the Secretary of Energy, Office of the Secretary of the Interior, and Office of the Solicitor.

1224 Dirksen Building

Small Business

To hold hearings to review small businesses' application of safe harbor leasing provisions of the Economic Recovery Act (Public Law 97-34).

424 Russell Building

9:30 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

Agricultural Research and General Legislation Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

324 Russell Building

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for Centers

for Disease Control, Department of Health and Human Services.

1114 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on the nomination of Howard K. Walker, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Togo.

4221 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Environment and Public Works

To continue hearings to review those items in the President's budget for fiscal year 1983 which fall within its legislative jurisdiction and consider recommendations which it will make thereon to the Budget Committee, receiving testimony from officials of the Economic Development Administration of the Department of Commerce, Appalachian Regional Commission, Federal Emergency Management Agency, and the Tennessee Valley Authority.

4200 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on the nomination of Hugh W. Foster, of California, to be Alternate Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank.

4221 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources

Aging, Family and Human Services Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine the impact of stress on the family caused by the workplace.

4232 Dirksen Building

10:30 a.m.

Veterans Affairs

To hold hearings to receive the Blinded Veterans Association, Paralyzed Veterans of America, and World War I veterans' legislative recommendations for fiscal year 1983.

318 Russell Building

11:00 a.m.

Foreign Relations

Business meeting, to consider pending nominations, and other committee business.

4221 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Health Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services.

1114 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works

To continue hearings to review those items in the President's budget for fiscal year 1983 which fall within its legislative jurisdiction and consider recommendations which it will make thereon to the Budget Committee, receiving testimony on water resources programs.

4200 Dirksen Building

MARCH 3

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior Subcommittee

To receive testimony from public witnesses on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for non-Indian programs.

1318 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Surface Transportation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 671, providing for comprehensive alcohol-traffic safety programs, and other related proposals.

235 Russell Building

Labor and Human Resources

Business meeting, to consider those matters and programs in the President's budget for fiscal year 1983 which fall within the committee's jurisdiction with a view toward submitting its views and budgetary recommendations to the Committee on the Budget by March 15.

4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration, Department of Health and Human Services.

1114 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works

Business meeting, to consider those matters and programs in the President's budget for fiscal year 1983 which fall within the committee's jurisdiction with a view toward submitting its views and budgetary recommendations to the Committee on the Budget by March 15.

4200 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations

International Economic Policy Subcommittee

To hold hearings on a U.S. assertion of extraterritoriality with respect to the Soviet-European gas pipeline.

4221 Dirksen Building

11:00 a.m.

*Veterans Affairs

Business meeting, to consider those matters and programs in the President's budget for fiscal year 1983 which fall within the committee's jurisdiction with a view toward submitting its views and budgetary recommendations to the Committee on the Budget by March 15.

412 Russell Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Health Resources Administration, Department of Health and Human Services.

1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 4

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

To resume hearings to review current economic conditions.

1114 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the American Battle Monuments Commission, Army cemetery expenses, the Office of Consumer Affairs, and Consumer Information Center.

1224 Dirksen Building

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Health Care Financing Administration, Department of Health and Human Services.

1114 Dirksen Building

*Environment and Public Works

*Business meeting, to continue consideration of those matters and programs in the President's budget for fiscal year 1983 which fall within the committee's jurisdiction with a view toward submitting its views and budgetary recommendations to the Committee on the Budget by March 15.

4200 Dirksen Building

Small Business

To hold hearings on S. 1947, improving small businesses' access to Federal procurement information.

424 Russell Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Social Security Administration and refugee programs, Department of Health and Human Services.

1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 5

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

To continue hearings to review current economic conditions.

1202 Dirksen Building

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for human development services of the Department of Health and Human Services.

1114 Dirksen Building

Select on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings to review the report of the Commission on Fiscal Accountability of the Department of the Interior on national energy resources.

6226 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Environment and Public Works

Business meeting, to continue consideration of those matters and programs in the President's budget for fiscal year 1983 which fall within the committee's jurisdiction with a view toward submitting its views and budgetary recommendations to the Committee on the Budget by March 15.

4200 Dirksen Building

MARCH 8

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Surface Transportation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on H.R. 3663, proposed Bus Regulatory Reform Act of 1981, and on the deregulation of the intercity bus industry.

235 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.

Finance

To resume hearings to review those items in the President's budget for fiscal year 1983 which fall within its legislative jurisdiction and consider

recommendations which it will make thereon to the Budget Committee.

2221 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

*Energy and Mineral Resources Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings to review the capacity, distribution and status of the strategic petroleum reserve.

3110 Dirksen Building

Select on Intelligence

To hold closed hearings on the proposed budget estimates for the intelligence community.

S-407, Capitol

MARCH 9

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Economic Regulatory Administration and the Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy.

1114 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Consumer Subcommittee

To hold hearings on product liability.

235 Russell Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

6226 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

*Environment and Public Works

Business meeting, to resume markup of proposed amendments to the Clean Air Act (Public Law 95-95).

4200 Dirksen Building

Finance

To continue hearings to review those items in the President's budget for fiscal year 1983 which fall within its legislative jurisdiction and consider recommendations which it will make thereon to the Budget Committee.

2221 Dirksen Building

Select on Intelligence

To continue closed hearings on the proposed budget estimates for the intelligence community.

S-407, Capitol

2:00 p.m.

Select on Intelligence

To continue closed hearings on the proposed budget estimates for the intelligence community.

S-407, Capitol

MARCH 10

9:30 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

Agricultural Research and General Legislation Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

324 Russell Building

*Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Consumer Affairs Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine certain financial institution practices restricting individuals from withdrawing funds represented by checks deposited to their accounts.

5302 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources

Business meeting, to resume consideration of those matters and programs in the President's budget for fiscal year 1983 which fall within the committee's jurisdiction with a view toward submitting its views and budgetary recommendations to the Committee on the Budget by March 15.

4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Environment and Public Works

Business meeting, to continue consideration of those matters and programs in the President's budget for fiscal year 1983 which fall within the committee's jurisdiction with a view toward submitting its views and budgetary recommendations to the Committee on the Budget by March 15.

4200 Dirksen Building

Finance

To continue hearings to review those items in the President's budget for fiscal year 1983 which fall within its legislative jurisdiction and consider recommendations which it will make thereon to the Budget Committee.

2221 Dirksen Building

10:30 a.m.

Select on Intelligence

To continue closed hearings on the proposed budget estimates for the intelligence community.

S-407, Capitol

2:00 p.m.

Select on Intelligence

To continue closed hearings on the proposed budget estimates for the intelligence community.

S-407, Capitol

MARCH 11

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

1114 Dirksen Building

Office of Technology Assessment

The Board, to hold a general business meeting.

S-205, Capitol

9:30 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

Agricultural Research and General Legislation Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

324 Russell Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Earthquake Hazard Reduction Act (Public Law 95-124).

235 Russell Building

Labor and Human Resources

Labor Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 1748, exempting certain employers from withdrawal and plan termination insurance provisions of title IV of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA).

4232 Dirksen Building

Small Business

To hold hearings on the Small Business Administration's surety bond guarantee loan program.

424 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.

*Environment and Public Works

Business meeting, to resume markup of proposed amendments to the Clean Air Act (Public Law 95-95).

4200 Dirksen Building

Finance

To continue hearings to review those items in the President's budget for fiscal year 1983 which fall within its legislative jurisdiction and consider recommendations which it will make thereon to the Budget Committee.

2221 Dirksen Building

Select on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings on H.R. 3731, extending the period of time in which the Secretary of the Interior shall prepare and submit to Congress a plan for the use and distribution of Indian judgment funds, within one year after appropriation, and to resume hearings to review those items in the President's budget for fiscal year 1983 which fall within its legislative jurisdiction and consider recommendations which it will make thereon to the Budget Committee.

424 Russell Building

MARCH 12

9:00 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

To hold joint hearings with the Subcommittee on Agency Administration of the Committee on the Judiciary on S. 1483, making the U.S. Government liable for damages to residents and participants arising from the fallout from certain atmospheric tests, establishing an advisory panel to study the adverse health effects, and transferring from the Department of Energy all functions relating to research on the health effects of radiation to the Department of Health and Human Services.

4232 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Consumer Subcommittee

To resume hearings on product liability.

235 Russell Building

Labor and Human Resources

Aging, Family and Human Services Subcommittee

To hold hearings on expanding employment opportunities for older workers.

6226 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Finance

To continue hearings to review those items in the President's budget for fiscal year 1983 which fall within its legislative jurisdiction and consider recommendations which it will make thereon to the Budget Committee.

2221 Dirksen Building

MARCH 15

9:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Surface Transportation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed authorizations for the railroad financial assistance program, Department of Transportation.

235 Russell Building

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources
Employment and Productivity Subcommittee

To hold joint hearings with the House Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities of the Committee on Education and Labor on S. 2036, H.R. 5320, and H.R. 5461, bills providing for State and local employment and training assistance programs, and on other related measures.

4232 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for elementary and secondary education and education block grant programs, Department of Education.

1114 Dirksen Building

Select on Intelligence

To resume closed hearings on the proposed budget estimates for the intelligence community.

S-407, Capitol

MARCH 16

9:00 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

Employment and Productivity Subcommittee

To continue joint hearings with the House Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities of the Committee on Education and Labor on S. 2036, H.R. 5320, and H.R. 5461, bills providing for State and local employment and training assistance programs, and on other related measures.

2175 Rayburn Building

9:30 a.m.

Commerce Science, and Transportation
Consumer Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on activities of the Federal Trade Commission, and on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Federal Trade Commission.

235 Russell Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

6226 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources

Aging, Family and Human Services Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the extended family.

4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Consumer Product Safety Commission and the Office of Revenue Sharing (New York City loan program).

1318 Dirksen Building

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for impact aid, vocational and adult education libraries and learning resources programs, Department of Education.

1114 Dirksen Building

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Finance

To hold hearings to review the administration's tax proposals for fiscal year 1983.

2221 Dirksen Building

Select on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 1894, permitting Indian tribes to enter certain agreements for the disposition of tribal mineral resources.

424 Russell Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for education for the handicapped, rehabilitation services and handicapped research programs, Department of Education.

1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 17

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior.

1224 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources

Employment and Productivity Subcommittee

To continue joint hearings with the House Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities of the Committee on Education and Labor on S. 2036, H.R. 5320, and H.R. 5461, bills providing for State and local employment and training assistance programs, and on other related measures.

2175 Rayburn Building

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed authorizations for fiscal years 1983 and 1984 for the National Bureau of Standards, Department of Commerce.

357 Russell Building

Labor and Human Resources

Labor Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 1748, exempting certain employers from withdrawal and plan termination insurance provisions of title IV of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA).

4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for student financial assistance, student loan insurance, a higher and continuing education, higher education facilities loan and insurance, college housing loans, educational research and training activities overseas, Department of Education.

1114 Dirksen Building

Finance

To continue hearings to review the administration's tax proposals for fiscal year 1983.

2221 Dirksen Building

Select on Indian Affairs

To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of public contracting

with private counsel provisions of the Indian Self-determination and Education Assistance Act (Public Law 93-638).

6226 Dirksen Building

1:30 p.m.

Appropriations

Interior Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior.

1224 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for National Institute of Education, fund for the improvement of post-secondary education (FIPSE), and education statistics, Department of Education.

1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 18

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for conservation programs of the Department of Energy.

1224 Dirksen Building

Labor and Hyman Resources

Employment and Productivity Subcommittee

To continue joint hearings with the House Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities of the Committee on Education and Labor on S. 2036, H.R. 5320, and H.R. 5461, bills providing for State and local employment and training assistance programs, and on other related measures.

4232 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Consumer Subcommittee

To resume oversight hearings on activities of the Federal Trade Commission, and on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Federal Trade Commission.

235 Russell Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To resume hearings, in closed session, on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

6226 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for special institutions, Howard University, departmental management (salaries and expenses), and the Office for Civil Rights, Department of Education.

1114 Dirksen Building

Finance

To continue hearings to review the administration's tax proposals for fiscal year 1983.

2221 Dirksen Building

MARCH 19

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Employment and Productivity Subcommittee
To hold hearings on productivity in the American economy.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Finance
To continue hearings to review the administration's tax proposals for fiscal year 1983.
2221 Dirksen Building

MARCH 23

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Holocaust Memorial Council, and the Bureau of Land Management of the Department of the Interior.
1114 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Select on Indian Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on the statute of limitations relating to Indian affairs.
6226 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Veterans' Administration.
1224 Dirksen Building
Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
4200 Dirksen Building

MARCH 25

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Office of Indian Education, Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation Commission, and the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation.
1114 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
4200 Dirksen Building

MARCH 26

9:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed authorizations for the railroad safety program, Department of Transportation.
235 Russell Building

9:30 a.m.
* Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Consumer Affairs Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the role of the Federal Government in the operation of U.S. payment systems.
5302 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources
Employment and Productivity Subcommittee
To resume hearings on productivity in the American economy.
4232 Dirksen Building

MARCH 29

10:00 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Toxic Substances and Environmental Oversight Subcommittee
To hold hearings to review proposed authorizations for the safe drinking water program.
4200 Dirksen Building

MARCH 30

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
235 Russell Building

Labor and Human Resources
Aging, Family and Human Services Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of sex education programs.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
4200 Dirksen Building

10:30 a.m.
Veterans Affairs
To hold hearings to receive Veterans of Foreign Wars legislative recommendations for fiscal year 1983.
318 Russell Building

MARCH 31

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for strategic petroleum reserve and Naval petroleum reserves of the Department of Energy.
1114 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on activities of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation.
235 Russell Building

Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings on proposed authorizations for certain health programs of the Department of Health and Human Services.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Toxic Substances and Environmental Oversight Subcommittee
To continue hearings to review proposed authorizations for the safe drinking water program.
4200 Dirksen Building

APRIL 1

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
235 Russell Building

Labor and Human Resources
Aging, Family and Human Services Subcommittee
To hold hearings on promoting volunteerism in America.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the Selective Service System.
1224 Dirksen Building

Select on Indian Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of indirect costs and contract provisions of the Indian Self-determination and Education Assistance Act (Public Law 93-638).
6226 Dirksen Building

APRIL 2

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Employment and Productivity Subcommittee
To resume hearings on productivity in the American economy.
4232 Dirksen Building

APRIL 14

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To hold oversight hearings on the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs, Department of Labor.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for activities of the Secretary of Health and Human Services.
1114 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for activities of the Secretary of Health and Human Services.
1114 Dirksen Building

APRIL 15

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the land and water conservation fund, and to receive testimony from congressional witnesses.
1318 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings on proposed authorizations for the National Science Foundation.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Office of Science and Technology Policy and the Council on Environmental Quality.
1224 Dirksen Building

APRIL 28

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for activities of the Secretary of Education.
1114 Dirksen Building

Select on Indian Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on the tribally controlled community college program.
6226 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for activities of the Secretary of Education.
1114 Dirksen Building

APRIL 16

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Employment and Productivity Subcommittee
To resume hearings on productivity in the American economy.
4232 Dirksen Building

APRIL 20

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for certain functions of the Indian Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services, and the Geological Survey, Department of the Interior.
1318 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to consider proposed legislation authorizing funds for health programs and the National Science Foundation.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Environmental Protection Agency.
1224 Dirksen Building
Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
4200 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for activities of the Secretary of Labor.
1114 Dirksen Building

APRIL 21

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Employment and Training Administration, Department of Labor.
1114 Dirksen Building

APRIL 22

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for certain

functions of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.
1318 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Aging, Family and Human Services Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of title X of the Public Health Service Act relating to the health aspects of teenage sexual activity.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Labor-Management Service Administration, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, and the Employment Standards Administration, Department of Labor.
1114 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), and the Mine Safety and Health Administration, Department of Labor.
1114 Dirksen Building

APRIL 23

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for Bureau of Labor Statistics, departmental management services, and the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, Department of Labor.
1114 Dirksen Building

APRIL 27

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Office of the Federal Inspector, Alaska Natural Gas Transportation System, Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior, and the National Endowment for the Arts.
1318 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the National Science Foundation.
1224 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on programs of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and related agencies.
1114 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To continue oversight hearings on programs of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and related agencies.
1114 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To continue oversight hearings on programs of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and related agencies.
1114 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To continue oversight hearings on programs of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and related agencies.
1114 Dirksen Building

APRIL 29

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for fossil research and development and fossil construction programs of the Department of Energy.
1318 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Aging, Family and Human Services Subcommittee
To hold hearings on community social support systems.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To continue oversight hearings on programs of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and related agencies.
1114 Dirksen Building

10:30 a.m.
Veterans Affairs
To hold hearings to receive AMVETS legislative recommendations for fiscal year 1983.
Room to be announced

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To continue oversight hearings on programs of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and related agencies.
1114 Dirksen Building

MAY 3

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings to receive testimony from public witnesses on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for certain programs under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.
1114 Dirksen Building

MAY 4

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Smithsonian Institution, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.
1318 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To hold oversight hearings on activities of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
1224 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings to receive testimony from public witnesses on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for certain programs under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.
1114 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings to receive testimony from public witnesses on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for certain programs under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.
1114 Dirksen Building
MAY 5

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings to receive testimony from public witnesses on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for certain programs under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.
1114 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings to receive testimony from public witnesses on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for certain programs under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.
1114 Dirksen Building
MAY 6

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, and the National Capital Planning Commission.
1318 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings to receive testimony from public witnesses on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for certain programs under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.
1114 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings to receive testimony from public witnesses on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for certain programs under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.
1114 Dirksen Building
MAY 7

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings to receive testimony from congressional witnesses on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for certain programs under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.
1114 Dirksen Building
MAY 11

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the National Endowment for the Humanities, Institute of Museum Services, and the Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior.
1114 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the National Institute of Building Sciences, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and National Credit Union Administration
1224 Dirksen Building
MAY 13

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for territorial affairs of the Department of the Interior.
1114 Dirksen Building

1:30 p.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for territorial affairs of the Department of the Interior
1114 Dirksen Building
MAY 18

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.
1224 Dirksen Building

*Select on Indian Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of Indian education programs.
6226 Dirksen Building
MAY 19

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Department of Housing and

Urban Development, and the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation.

1224 Dirksen Building
Select on Indian Affairs
To resume oversight hearings on the implementation of Indian education programs.
6226 Dirksen Building
MAY 24

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To receive testimony from public witnesses on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for certain programs under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.
1224 Dirksen Building
MAY 25

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To receive testimony from public witnesses on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for certain programs under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.
1224 Dirksen Building

JUNE 9
9:30 a.m.
Select on Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on proposed legislation providing for the appointment of special magistrates to serve each Indian reservation over which the United States exercises criminal jurisdiction under existing law.
6226 Dirksen Building
SEPTEMBER 21

10:30 a.m.
Veterans Affairs
To hold hearings to receive American Legion legislative recommendations for fiscal year 1983.
318 Russell Building

CANCELLATIONS

February 24

9:30 a.m.
Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 53, S. 1761, S. 1975, and S. 1992, bills extending the effects of certain provisions of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.
2228 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
3110 Dirksen Building

Judiciary
Security and Terrorism Subcommittee
To resume hearings to examine the presence of Cuban intelligence operations within the United States.
357 Russell Building

2:00 p.m.
Judiciary
To continue closed oversight hearings on the Public Integrity Section of the Criminal Division, Department of Justice.
2228 Dirksen Building